

THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS

LIBRARY

057
SL
v.1

ENGLISH

SCIENCE

Return this book on or before the
Re Date stamped below. A
Use is made on all overdue
books.

University of Illinois Library

5 Aug 52

5-2-55

JUL 31 1987

BUILDING USE ONLY

STAMP

NOV 24 1987

DEC 3 1963

NOV 24 1987

JAN 5

1965

OCT 13 1972

OCT 6 1972

AUG 10 1978

JUL 27 1978

JUL 25 1987

L161—H41

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
2453/
258
See

THE SLAVONIC REVIEW

A SURVEY OF THE SLAVONIC PEOPLES,
THEIR HISTORY, ECONOMICS, PHILOLOGY
AND LITERATURE

EDITORS :

BERNARD PARES
R. W. SETON-WATSON
HAROLD WILLIAMS

Published Thrice Yearly
(in each Academic Term)

Price 5/- net per copy
Annual Subscription, 15/- post free

PUBLISHED BY

THE SCHOOL OF SLAVONIC STUDIES
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON, KING'S COLLEGE

EYRE AND SPOTTISWOODE, LIMITED,
HIS MAJESTY'S PRINTERS, AT 9, EAST HARDING STREET, E.C.4

EYRE & SPOTTISWOODE, LTD.,
HIS MAJESTY'S PRINTERS,
EAST HARDING STREET, LONDON, E.C. 4

EDITORS:

BERNARD PARES, R. W. SETON-WATSON, HAROLD WILLIAMS

CONTRIBUTORS TO VOLUME I.

BAYKALOV, A. V.

BEZA, MARCU.

BLAKEY, KATE.

BULGAKOV, SERGIUS.

CHESHIRE, H. T.

CHIROL, VALENTINE.

CHUDOBA, F.

COPELAND, FANNY S.

DÁNIEL, ARNOLD.

DRACHOVSKÝ, JOSEF.

DYBOSKI, ROMAN.

EISENMANN, LOUIS.

ELTON, OLIVER.

FET, A. A.

FORBES, NEVILL.

FORTEY, FRANK H.

GARDNER, MONICA.

GAVRILOVIĆ, M. (Jugoslav Minister
in London).

GROGAN, ELLINOR.

JAGIĆ, VATROSLAV.

JOPSON, N. B.

KIESEWETTER, ALEXANDER

KUTRZEBA, STANISLAS.

LYATSKY, EUGENE.

MACEK, JOSEF.

MASARYK, THOMAS G. (President
of the Czechoslovak Republic).

MEYENDORFF, ALEXANDER.

MILLER, MARGARET S.

MINNS, ELLIS H.

MIRSKY, D. SVYATOPOLK,

NEWMARCH, ROSA.

NOVÁK, ARNE.

NOVGORODTSEV, PAUL.

PARES, BERNARD.

PENSON, J. H.

REYMONT, W. S.

SETON-WATSON, R. W.

SHULGIN, VLADIMIR.

SKIRMUNT, CONSTANTINE (Polish
Minister in London).

STRUVE, PETER.

VOČADLO, OTAKAR.

VOJNOVIĆ, IVO.

WHARTON, L. C.

WILLIAMS, HAROLD.

ŽELEZNIKAR, A.

ZIELIŃSKI, THADDAEUS.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
The Slavs after the War. By THOMAS G. MASARYK, President of the Czechoslovak Republic	2
Russia. By PETER STRUVE	24
A Survey of Slavistic Studies. By VATROSLAV JAGIĆ	41
The Objectives of Russian Study in Britain. By SIR BERNARD PARES	59
The Composition of the Earlier Russian Chronicles. By NEVILL FORBES	73
The Early Diplomatic Relations of Great Britain and Serbia. By MICHAEL GAVRILOVIĆ, Yugoslav Minister in London I., II., III., 86, 333.	552
The Radicals of the Sixties and their Leaders. By H. T. CHESHIRE	110
Percy's Reliques, Sir Walter Scott's Minstrelsy and the Roumanian Ballads. By MARCU BEZA	121
A Brief Outline of the Russian Co-operative Movement. By A. BAYKALOV	130
+ Land Reform in Czechoslovakia. By JOSEPH MACEK	144
The Agrarian Problem in Hungary. By ARNOLD DÁNIEL	151
At the Feast of the Gods: Contemporary Dialogues. By SERGIUS BULGAKOV. I., II., III.	172, 391, 604
The Dying Republic, Act I. By COUNT IVO VOJNOVIĆ	184
Poland. By CONSTANTINE SKIRMUNT, Polish Minister in London	273
+ Political and Economic Progress in Poland. By STANISLAS KUTRZEBA	277
Slavonic Studies in France. By LOUIS EISENMANN	295
Transylvania. By R. W. SETON-WATSON. I., II.	306, 533
+ Memorials of the Czech Reformation. By ARNE NOVÁK	323
Some Thoughts on the Style of Dostoyevsky. By EUGENE LYATSKY	352
Leoš Janáček and Moravian Music Drama. By ROSA NEWMARCH	362
The Months before the Russian Revolution. By V. SHULGIN	380
The Trade Balance of Russia. By MARGARET S. MILLER	401
Difficulties of the Exchange in Czechoslovakia. By JOSEF DRACHOVSKÝ	419
The Polish Peasants. By W. S. REYMONT. I., II.	428, 598

	PAGE
On Slavonic Reciprocity. By PAUL NOVGORODTSEV ...	497
Klyuchevsky and his Course of Russian History. By ALEXANDER KIESEWETTER	504
Slavistic Studies: an Addendum. By VATROSLAV JAGIĆ ...	523
Early Russian Folk Epics. By KATE BLAKEY... ..	525
Bulgaria under Prince Alexander. By LADY GROGAN...	561
Labour Conditions in Modern Poland. By J. H. PENSON ...	572
The Peasant in Polish Literature (I.). By THADDAEUS ZIELIŃSKI	584

POEMS.

The Hawk at Liberty. By A. A. FET (Oliver Elton)...	217
Forget Me, Madman. By A. A. FET (O. Elton) ...	217
Gadfly and Ant. By IVAN KRYLOV (Bernard Pares) ...	437
Two Dogs. By IVAN KRYLOV	438
An Exile's Hymn at Sunset on the Sea. By SŁOWACKI (F. H. Fortey)	439
The Death of Ivo: A Croat Ballad (R. W. Seton-Watson) ...	440
An Episode from Pushkin's Fairy Tales (O. Elton) ...	623

Obituary	218-228, 443-7, 632-645
Chronicle Notes	229-240, 448-463, 646-658
Economic Notes	241-245, 659-665
Reviews	246-269, 463-489, 666-695
Bibliographical Notes	269-272, 490-4, 696-702
Miscellaneous Notes	494-6, 703-4

INDEX.

- Alexander von Battenberg*, E. C. CORTI, 246.
 AKHMATOVA, ANNA, Poems, 690.
 Anglo-Russian Literary Society, 703.
- BAYKALOV, A., A Brief Outline of the Russian Co-operative Movement, 130.
 BEZA, M., Percy's Reliques, Scott's Minstrelsy and the Roumanian Ballads, 121.
Bezbozhnik, 695.
 Bibliographical Notes—
 Czechoslovak Ethnography, History and Literature (F. Chudoba), 269.
 Foreign Verdicts on Russia (Baron A. Meyendorff), 490.
 Recent Bulgarian Literature (L. C. Wharton), 696.
 BLAKEY, KATE, Early Russian Folk Epics, 525.
 BLOK, ALEXANDER, 218.
Bohemia, C. E. Maurice, 489.
 BOURCHIER, J. D., 227.
 BULGAKOV, SERGIUS, At the Feast of the Gods, 172, 391, 604.
 Bulgaria under Prince Alexander, by Lady Grogan, 561.
 Bulgarian Literature, Recent, 696.
- CHESHIRE, H. T., Russian Radicals of the Sixties, 110.
 — The Moscow Art Theatre Abroad, 691.
Chetki, Anna Akhmatova, 690.
 CHIROL, SIR VALENTINE, Russian Bolshevism and Islam, 656.
 Chronicle Notes—
 Czechoslovakia, 238, 652.
 Jugoslavia, 236.
 Poland, 456, 647.
 Russia, 229, 448, 646.
 Chronicles, Composition of the Earlier Russian, by N. Forbes, 73.
 CHUDOBA, F., Hviezdoslav, 222; J. S. Myslbek, 632; Bibliographical Notes, 269; The Jail (Machar), 259; Otakar Březina (Selver), 259.
 Co-operative Movement in Russia, The by A. Baykalov, 130.
 COPELAND, F. S., translation of *The Dying Republic*, 184.
 — Shakespeare Translations in Slovene, 261.
 Corti, E. C., *Alexander von Battenberg*, 246.
- Croat Ballad, A, 440.
 Czechoslovakia, Land Reform in, by J. Macek, 145.
 — Difficulties of the Exchange in, by J. Drachovský, 419.
Czechoslovak Republic, The, by J. Císár and F. Pokorný, 489.
 Czech Reformation, Memorials of the, by Arne Novák, 323.
- DÁNIEL, ARNOLD, The Agrarian Problem in Hungary, 151.
Diplomacy, Forty Years of, Baron Rosen, 687.
Disobedient Kids, The, 489.
 Dostoyevsky, Some Thoughts on the Style of, by Eugene Lyatsky, 352.
 DRACHOVSKÝ, J., Difficulties of the Exchange in Czechoslovakia, 419.
 DYBOSKI, PROFESSOR, His Work in England, 651.
 —, Pessimism in Excelsis, 666.
- EBERT, MAX, Südrussland in Altertum, 690.
 Economic Notes—
 Czechoslovakia, 243, 663.
 Jugoslavia, 664.
 Poland, 663.
 Russia, 241, 659.
 EISENMANN, LOUIS, Slavonic Studies in France, 295.
 ELTON, OLIVER, Poems from the Russian of A. A. Fet, 217; Episode from Pushkin's Fairy Tales, 623.
Europa-Rosja-Azja, M. Zdziechowski, 666.
- Feast of the Gods, At the, by S. Bulgakov, 172, 391, 604.
 FET, A. A., Poems, 217.
 FORBES, NEVILL, The Composition of the Earlier Russian Chronicles, 73.
 Forget me, Madman, 217.
 FORTEY, F. H., An Exile's Hymn, 439.
- Gardner, Monica, *Koń na Wzgórzcu* (Malaczewski), 478.
 GAVRILOVIĆ, M., The Early Diplomatic Relations of Great Britain and Serbia, 86, 333, 552; *Druga Vlada Miloša i Mihaila*, 684; *Iz Srbije Kneza Miloša*, 684.
Grammaire de la Langue Tchèque, A. Mazon, 482.

- GROGAN, LADY, Bulgaria under Prince Alexander, 561; the Bishop of Stara Zagora, 641; Ivan Vazov, 225.
- GUMILEV, N. S., 221.
- Hamlet* in Servian, 693.
- Hawk at Liberty, The, 217.
- Hungary, The Agrarian Problem in by Arnold Dániel, 151.
- Hviezdoslav, Pavol Országh, 222.
- Ivo, The Death of, 440.
- Izvol'sky, *Memoirs of Alexander*, 685.
- JAGIĆ, VATROSLAV, A Survey of Slavistic Studies, 40; Addendum, 523.
- Janáček, Leoš, and Moravian Music Drama, by Mrs. Newmarch, 362.
- Járník, J. U., 645.
- JASZI, OSCAR, *Magyariens Schuld, Ungarns Sühne*, 675.
- JOPSON, N. B., *Othello* and *Hamlet* in Serbian, 693.
- Jugoslavia, Study of English in, 496.
- Jugoslavia, La*, O. Randi, 680.
- Kalina, Antonin, 639.
- KIESEWETTER, see Klyuchevsky.
- Klyuchevsky and his Course of Russian History, by A. Kieseewetter, 504.
- Kon na Wzgorzu*, E. Mataczewski, 478.
- Kramář, K., *Ruská Krise*, 471.
- Krylov, Fables of, 437, 438.
- KUTRZEBA, S., Political and Economic Progress in Poland, 277.
- Labour Conditions in Poland, 572.
- Land Reform in Czechoslovakia, 144.
- in Hungary, 157.
- Low, D. H., *The Ballads of Marko Kraljević*, 481.
- Lunacharski, A. V., *Vasilissa the Wise*, 695.
- LYATSKY, EUGENE, Some Thoughts on the Style of Dostoyevsky, 352.
- Macbeth* in Slovene, 261.
- MACEK, JOSEF, Land Reform in Czechoslovakia, 144.
- Machar, J. S., *The Jail*, 258.
- Magyariens Schuld, Ungarns Sühne*, Oszkar Jászi, 675.
- Malaczewski, E., *Koń na Wzgorzu*, 478.
- Marko Kraljević, The Ballads of*, 481.
- MASARYK, PRESIDENT T. G., The Slavs after the War, 2.
- Maurice, C. E., *Bohemia*, 489.
- Mazon, André, *Grammaire de la Langue Tchèque*, 482.
- Merchant of Venice* in Slovene, 261.
- MEYENDORFF, BARON A., Foreign Verdicts on Russia, 490; *Forty Years of Diplomacy* (Rosen), 687.
- Midsummer Night's Dream* in Slovene, 261.
- MILLER, MARGARET S., The Trade Balance of Russia, 401.
- MINNS, E. H., *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia* (Rostovtsev), 688.
- Miloša i Mihaila, Druga Vlada* (S. Jovanovi), 684.
- Miloša, Iz Srbije Kneza* (T. R. Gjorgjević), 684.
- MIRSKY, PRINCE D. SVYATOPOLK, Recent Books on Pushkin, 475; Recent Russian Anthologies, 255; Poems of Akhmatova, 690; N. S. Gumilev, 221.
- Nabokov, Vladimir, 443.
- Nachala*, No. 1, 266.
- Manka o Stikhe*, V. Brynsov, 265.
- NEWMARCH, ROSA, Janáček and Moravian Music Drama, 362.
- NOVÁK, ARNE, Memorials of the Czech Reformation, 323.
- NOVGORODTSEV, P., on Slavonic Reciprocity, 497.
- O'BEIRNE, J. J. R., *Serbo-Croatian Self-Taught*, 264.
- Obituary:—Bishop of Stara Zagora, 641; A. Blok, 218; J. D. Bourchier, 227; N. S. Gumilev, 221; Hviezdoslav, 222; J. U. Jarník, 644; A. Kalina, 639; J. V. Myslbek, 632; Vl. Nabokov, 443; A. Rašin, 636; Serg. Shidlovsky, 445; Ivan Tavčar, 643; Ivan Vazov, 225.
- Objectives of Russian Study in Britain, by Sir B. Pares, 59.
- Othello* in Serbian, 693.
- PARES, SIR BERNARD, The Objectives of Russian Study in Britain, 59; Gadfly and Ant (Krylov), 437; Two Dogs (Krylov), 438; *Vospominania* (Count Witte), 463; *Memoirs of Alexander Izvol'sky*, 685.
- PENSON, J. H., Labour Conditions in Modern Poland, 372.
- Poland, by Constantine Skirmunt, 273.
- Poland, Political and Economic Progress in, by S. Kutrzeba, 277.
- Polish Literature, The Peasant in, by T. Zieliński, (I.), 584.
- Polish Peasants, The, by W. S. Reymont, 428, 598.
- Pushkin, Recent Books on, 475.
- 's Fairy Tales, translated by O. Elton, 623.

- Randi, O., *La Jugoslavia*, 680.
 Rašin, Alois, 636.
Revue des Études Slaves, 268.
 REYMONT, W. S., *The Polish Peasants*, 428, 598.
 Rosen, Baron R., *Forty Years of Diplomacy*, 687.
 Rostovtsev, M. I., *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*, 688.
 Roumanian Ballads, Percy's Reliques, Scott's Minstrelsy, and the, by M. Beza, 121.
 Rudolf, Kronprinz, *Politische Briefe*, 673.
 Russia, by Peter Struve, 24.
 —, *Foreign Verdicts on*, 490.
 —, *The Trade Balance of*, by M. S. Miller, 401.
 Russian Bolshevism and Islam, by Sir V. Chirol, 656.
 — *Co-operative Movement*, A Brief Survey of the, by A. Baykalov, 130.
 — *Folk-Epics, Early*, by K. Blakey, 525.
 — *Radicals of the Sixties*, by H. T. Cheshire, 110.
 — *Revolution, The Months before the*, by V. Shulgin, 380.
 — *Studies in Britain*, 59.
 Selver, P., *Otakar Březina*, 259.
Serbo-Croatian Self-Taught, J. J. R. O'Beirne, 264.
 SETON-WATSON, R. W., *Transylvania*, 306, 533; Alois Rašin, 636; Antonin Kalina, 639; *The Death of Ivo*, 440; *Alexander von Battenberg* (Corti), 246; *von Belgrad bis Buccari* (Wendel), 267; *Ballads of Marko Kraljević* (Low), 481; *Magyariens Schuld* (Jászai), 675; *La Jugoslavia* (Randi), 680.
 Shidlovsky, Sergius, 445.
 SHULGIN, V., *The Months before the Russian Revolution*, 380.
 SKIRMUNT, C., *Poland*, 273.
 Slavistic Studies, A Survey of, by V. Jagić, 40; Addendum, 523.
 Slavonic Reciprocity, by P. Novgorodtsev, 496.
 Slavonic Reviews, Notes on Other, 700.
 — *Studies in France*, by L. Eisenmann, 295; in Germany, 495.
 Slavs after the War, The, by President T. G. Masaryk, 2.
 SŁOWACKI, JULIUS, *An Exile's Hymn at Sunset on the Sea*, 439.
 Soviet Figures, How to Use, 661.
 Stara Zagora, Bishop of, 641.
 Stefanović, Svetislav, *Otelo, Hamlet*, 693.
Südrussland in Altertum, M. Ebert, 690.
 Tolstoy, Leo, *War and Peace*, 695.
 Transylvania, by R. W. Seton-Watson, 306, 533.
Vasilissa the Wise, by A. V. Lunacharski, 695.
 Vazov, Ivan, by Lady Grogan, 225.
 VOČADLO, O., J. U. Jarník, 644; *Grammaire de la Langue Tchèque* (Mazon), 482.
 VOJNOVIĆ, COUNT IVO, *The Dying Republic*, Act I., 184.
Von Belgrad bis Buccari, H. Wendel, 267.
Vospominania, Count S. Y. Witte, 463.
War and Peace, Tolstoy, 695.
 Wendel, Hermann, *Von Belgrad bis Buccari*, 267; *Aus den südslavischen Risorgimento*, 268.
 WHARTON, L. C., *Bibliography of Recent Bulgarian Literature*, 696.
 WILLIAMS, HAROLD, *Alexander Blok*, 218; J. D. Bourchier, 227; *Ruska Krise* (Kramář), 471.
 WITTE, COUNT, S. Y., *Vospominania*, 463.
 ZDZIECHOWSKI, M., *Europa - Rosja - Azja*, 666.
 ŽELEZNIKAR, A., *Ivan Tavčar*, 643.
 ZIELIŃSKI, T., *The Peasant in Political Literature* (I.), 584.
 Zupančič, Oton, *Shakespeare Translations* by, 261.

sent to ...
11/1/23

THE SLAVONIC REVIEW

A Survey of the Slavonic Peoples,
Their History, Economics, Philology and Literature

VOLUME ONE.

PUBLISHED BY THE SCHOOL OF SLAVONIC STUDIES
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON, KING'S COLLEGE

1922-23.

AS a result of the Great War, the English-speaking peoples were for the first time in history brought into direct and intimate relations both with Russia and the smaller Slavonic nations, then still struggling to be free. But before the new-found friendship could be cemented by time and fuller knowledge, events of supreme tragedy intervened, and so far as Russia is concerned the obstacles to mutual understanding are for the moment greater than they ever were in the past, though at the same time the need for such an understanding is more urgent and perhaps more keenly felt. It is this fundamental fact in the present situation that encourages us to establish the *Slavonic Review*—in the first place as the organ of the School of Slavonic Studies at the University of London, King's College, but also in a wider sense, as the organ of all those who have Slavonic sympathies or interests, and who desire to promote good relations between the English-speaking and Slavonic worlds.

The *Slavonic Review* will be devoted to the history, institutions, political and economic conditions, and also to the literature, arts, learning and philology of all the Slavonic nations, and in a lesser degree of their neighbours and associates in the former Russian Empire and in the former Dual Monarchy. It will be the joint product of British and American Slavonic scholars, and of representative Slavs in every field of intellectual effort. While maintaining the highest academic standards and assuring an impartial hearing to every school of thought, it will endeavour to keep its readers periodically informed upon all the main intellectual and political currents of modern Slav life.

057
54
11

NOV 14 26
Anell

Contents of Number I.

THE POSITION OF THE SLAVS IN THE NEW EUROPE.
By **Thomas G. Masaryk**, President of the Czecho-Slovak Republic.

RUSSIA. By **Peter Struve**, Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Editor of *Russkaya Mysl*.

A SURVEY OF SLAVISTIC STUDIES. By **Vatroslav Jagić**, late Professor of Slavonics at the University of Vienna.

At the Feast of the Gods : Dialogues on the Russian Revolution. By **SERGIUS BULGAKOV**.

The Early Diplomatic Relations of Great Britain and Serbia (I). By **MICHAEL GAVRILOVIĆ**, Jugoslav Minister in London.

The Objectives of Russian Study in Britain. By **Sir BERNARD PARES**, K.B.E., Professor of Russian at the University of London.

The Composition of the Earlier Russian Chronicles. By **NEVILL FORBES**, Professor of Russian in the University of Oxford.

The Russian Radicals of the Sixties. By **H. T. CHESHIRE**.

Percy's "Reliques," Sir Walter Scott's "Minstrelsy," and the Roumanian Ballads. By **MARCU BEZA**, Lecturer in Roumanian at King's College.

The Russian Co-operative Movement : a brief outline. By **A. V. BAIKALOV**, Chairman of the British section of the Union of Siberian Co-operative Societies (Zakupsbyt).

Land Reform in Czecho-Slovakia. By **JOSEPH MACEK**.

The Agrarian Problem in Hungary. By **ARNOLD DÁNIEL**.

The Dying Republic. Act I. Translated from the Serbo-Croat of **COUNT IVO VOJNOVIĆ**, by **Fanny S. Copeland**.

Poems. Translated from the Russian of **A. A. FET**, by Professor **Oliver Elton**.

Obituary : Alexander Blok (H. Williams): Alexis Shahmatov (H. W.): N. Gumilev (Prince D. Mirski): Pavel Országh-Hviezdoslav (F. Chudoba): Ivan Vazov (Lady Grogan): J. D. Bouchier.

Chronicle (Russia-Genoa-Czecho-Slovakia-Jugoslavia). Notes. Reviews. Bibliography.

To The Editors,

SLAVONIC REVIEW,

King's College, London, W.C.2.

Please supply me with the Slavonic Review, for which I enclose the sum of 15/-, being the subscription for one year (post free).

[Strike out
all or part,
as desired.]

Please keep me informed as to the activities of Slavonic Societies in this country,
University lectures, etc.* I am specially interested in

Russia
Poland
*Czechoslovakia
Jugoslavia
Bulgaria

From

Name.....

(Please state whether Mr., Mrs., or title)

Address.....

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON, KING'S COLLEGE.

SCHOOL OF SLAVONIC STUDIES.

ADVISORY SLAVONIC COMMITTEE.

The Advisory Slavonic Committee is appointed by the Senate.

Chairman : The LORD TREOWEN, C.B., C.M.G.

Secretary : Professor SIR BERNARD PARES, K.B.E., King's College.

The LORD CARNOCK, P.C., G.C.B. (Chairman of the United Russia Societies Association).

The LORD EMMOTT, P.C., G.C.M.G.

SIR SAMUEL HOARE, Bart., C.M.G., M.P.

SIR CHARLES WAKEFIELD, Bart. (formerly Lord Mayor of London).

SIR ARTHUR EVANS, D.Litt., F.R.S.

PROFESSOR SIR I. GOLLANCZ, Litt.D., F.B.A. (Secretary of the British Academy).

PROFESSOR SIR CHARLES OMAN, K.B.E., M.P.

PROFESSOR SIR E. DENISON ROSS, C.I.E. (Director of the School of Oriental Studies).

SIR MICHAEL SADLER, K.C.S.I. (Vice-Chancellor of the University of Leeds).

PROFESSOR SIR PAUL VINOGRADOV, D.C.L., LL.D., F.B.A. (University of Oxford).

F. R. ANDERTON (Chairman of the London County Council).

PROFESSOR H. G. ATKINS (King's College).

ERNEST BARKER, LL.D. (Principal of King's College).

Mrs. RONALD BURROWS.

Colonel G. CROSFIELD, D.S.O.

M. W. DONALD (Board of Trade).

PROFESSOR NEVILL FORBES (Professor of Slavonic Languages in the University of Oxford).

E. A. BRAYLEY HODGETTS (Chairman of the Russian Section of the London Chamber of Commerce).

ALBERT MANSBRIDGE (Chairman of the World Association for Adult Education).

PROFESSOR A. P. NEWTON, D.Litt. (Professor of Imperial History, King's College).

PROFESSOR A. J. SARGENT (The London School of Economics).

S. T. SHOVELTON (Secretary of King's College).

PROFESSOR R. W. SETON-WATSON (Professor of Central European History, King's College).

Lieutenant-Colonel F. C. TANNER, C.M.G., D.S.O. (War Office).

PROFESSOR M. V. TROFIMOV (Professor of Russian in the University of Manchester).

LESLIE URQUHART (Chairman of the British Russia Club).

C. HAGBERG WRIGHT, LL.D. (Librarian of the London Library).

ROBERT F. YOUNG (Hon. Secretary of the Czech Society of Great Britain).

STAFF.

Administrative Director—Professor Sir BERNARD PARES, K.B.E.

Comparative Slavonic Philology—N. B. JOPSON (Reader).

Russian Department—PROFESSOR PARES.

Russian Language - - - A. RAFFI (Lecturer).

Russian Literature - - - Prince D. SVYATOPOLK-MIRSKY
(Lecturer).

Russian History - - - Sir B. PARES (Professor).

Ethnography of Russia - - - HAROLD WILLIAMS, PH.D. (Lecturer),

Russian Laws and Institutions - } Baron A. F. MEYENDORFF (Lecturer).
Russian Economic Conditions - }

Polish Language and Literature L. WHARTON (Lecturer).

Central European Department—Professor SETON-WATSON.

Central European History - - R. W. SETON-WATSON, D.Litt.
(Professor).

Czechoslovak Language and Literature. F. CHUDOBA, Ph.D. (Lecturer).

Serbo-Croat Language and Literature. D. SUBOTIĆ, Ph.D. (Lecturer).

Librarian - - - - L. WHARTON (of the British Museum).

Travelling Students of the School { T. O. HIRST, Ph.D. (Czechoslovakia).
H. T. CHESHIRE (Czechoslovakia).

COURSES OF STUDY.

Bachelor of Arts, Honours.—Russian, Polish, Czechoslovak, Yugoslav. In each of these subjects the student can take *either* philology and literature *or* history and economics. In each case, either of the two subjects named can be taken as a special study, and the other as subsidiary. The following extra subsidiary subjects are required : for philology, another European language, preferably German ; for literature, another European literature ; for history, modern European history from Peter the Great ; for economics, modern economic history and organisation from 1800.

Bachelor of Arts, Pass.—Russian, Polish, Czechoslovak, Yugoslav. In each of these groups the subjects are as follows : translation and

composition; history including laws and institutions, together with political geography; *either* literature, *or* economics with economic geography.

Bachelor of Commerce (at the London School of Economics).—The student may specialise in his final year of study in the economic conditions of Russia.

Diploma.—Russian, Polish, Czechoslovak, Yugoslav. In each of these groups the subjects are as follows: translation and composition; history including laws and institutions, together with political geography; literature, more particularly as one of the principal expressions of social history; economics with economic geography. The Diploma need not involve Matriculation and does not confer a University Degree.

Certificates.—There is a University Certificate in Russian. A College Certificate in Russian is also obtainable after an intensive course of five months or more in the language.

Journalism.—Students can take Russian as one of the subjects qualifying for the University Diploma in Journalism.

Public Lectures.—Lectures designed for students but also open to the public will be given during the coming session on the following subjects:—Contemporary Russia from 1861 (18), Professor Pares; Austria-Hungary from 1867 (10), Professor Seton-Watson; Serbia and the Yugoslav Movement (10), Professor Seton-Watson; Russian Reconstruction (6), Baron Meyendorff; Pushkin, Leskov and Blok (3), Prince D. S. Mirsky; The Original Home of the Slavs (1), N. B. Jopson; Modern Czech Novelists (3), Dr. F. Chudoba; The Rise of Modern Bulgaria (2), Lady Grogan; Bohemian Exiles in England in the XVIIth Century (1), R. F. Young; Polish Literature (3), L. Wharton; and others.

The King's College Russian Society, consisting of students and their friends, meets weekly on Saturdays to hear single lectures on current questions, mostly given in Russian.

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD:

Professor of Slavonic Languages: Professor NEVILL FORBES.

Bachelor of Arts, Honours, Russian. Two Years' Course mostly linguistic and literary, but history, social and political, especially the former, are also included both in the lectures and in the examination.

Courses of old Bulgarian, the history of the Russian language and the history of Russian literature are given in rotation.

A composition class, besides private tuition, is held for two hours weekly.

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE :

Reader in Russian : Dr. A. P. GOUDY.

Bachelor of Arts, Honours. Part I. Translation, composition, essay in Russian. Part II. Historical and comparative philology; literature and history; Russian literature, thought and history since 1700; Russian history since 1800, specially Russian economic and social conditions since 1856; Russian history, life and literature before 1700; history and institutions of Slavonic peoples. Church Slavonic, Old Russian and Lithuanian can be offered as supplementary subjects. A Certificate of competent knowledge can also be taken. Other Slavonic languages may be taken in Part I.

A class in Russian for naval officers and others is also held.

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW :

Reader in Russian, HUGH BRENNAN.

Bachelor of Arts, Honours and Pass. Russian can be taken as an optional language in a group of modern languages.

Lectures are given in Russian literature, history and economics. Elementary classes are also held both in the University and in the Glasgow and West of Scotland Commercial College.

UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL :

School of Russian Studies. Professor of Russian History, Language and Literature : A. BRUCE BOSWELL; Lecturer in Russian : B. S. SLEPCHENKO; Research Fellow in the Ethnography of Russia (non-resident) : HAROLD WILLIAMS, Ph.D.

Honours Degree Course in Arts.—Three Years' Course. First year : Language, literature, history, and economics; Second and Third years : Literature *or* history *or* economics, dissertation.

Degree in Commerce.—Candidates for this degree may take Russia as a special subject in the Second and Third years of the Course.

Ordinary Degree Course in Arts.—Under the head of Russian, the student may select two of the following :—

- (a) Language and literature.
- (b) History.
- (c) Economics.

University Certificate in Russian.—The subject for Russian in the Ordinary Degree can be taken without any others for the Certificate. Two Years' Course. Matriculation not required.

[The Russian Library of the School numbers about 4,000 volumes. The Russian Society, including students and their friends, meets for discussion and study.]

UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER :

Professor of Russian, Professor M. V. TROFIMOV.

Bachelor of Arts, Honours. Translation; essay; Old Slavonic and Old Russian texts; history of the language; outlines of the literature; outlines of the history of Russian civilisation.

Bachelor of Arts, Pass. The Russian language.

Elementary classes are also held. Russian can also be offered in the examination for the Degree of Bachelor of Commerce.

Evening classes can be taken both for B.A. Pass and for B. Com.

UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM :

Professor of Russian, Professor H. J. W. TILLYARD.

B.A. Honours Degree. Three courses are given in Russian: Elementary, Middle and Advanced.

A course is held for commerce students, including commercial geography, natural resources, institutions and trading methods. Lectures in Russian are given on Russian literature and life. Three courses are also given in the Birmingham and Midland Institute.

UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS :

Lecturer in Russian : J. KOLNY-BALOTSKY.

Russian can be offered as a special subject for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts. The subject includes language, literature, history, institutions, economics, and the achievements of Russian scholars in art and science.

Russian can also be taken for the Diploma in Commerce.

Elementary classes are also given.

Elementary teaching in Russian is provided in the Hull Central School of Commerce.

UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD :

Lecturer in Russian : G. A. BIRKETT.

Bachelor of Arts. Russian can be taken either as a primary or as a secondary subject. Elementary classes are also held.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, NOTTINGHAM :

Professor of Russian, Professor JANKO LAVRIN.

Three Years' Course : (a) classes for students of Russian language and literature; with this course is combined one in Serbian for purposes of comparison; (b) course in Russian for students of commerce.

The professor has also delivered in the past session public lectures on Tolstoy as a Thinker (6) and on A Synthetic Outline of Slavonic Literature (6).

A Russian Society meets for study and discussion.

CONFERENCES OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS
OF RUSSIAN AND OTHER SLAVONIC LANGUAGES.

<i>Chairman of Conference</i>	- -	Professor N. Forbes (Oxford).
<i>Secretary of Conference</i>	- -	A. Raffi (London).
<i>Chairman of Standing Committee</i>		Professor Sir B. Pares (London).
<i>Chairman of Philological Committee.</i>		Professor N. Forbes.
<i>Committee for Questions on Books</i>		Baron A. F. Meyendorff and Mr. L. Wharton.

The Conference, which was in this session attended by representatives from all the universities concerned, meets once or twice a year to discuss all questions relating to scholarship and to the advancement of Slavonic Studies.

The Conference agreed that university students should be allowed to work either in the old or in the new spelling of Russian at their own choice, so long as they adhere consistently to one or the other system.

The Conference in October, 1921, recommended the following system of **transliteration of Russian** :—

а — a	л — l	ч — ch
б — b	м — m	ш — sh
в — v	н — n	щ — shch
г — g (h)	о — o	ъ — omit
д — d	п — p	ы — i
е — e	р — r	ь — '
ё — ë	с — s	ѣ — e
ж — zh	т — t	э — e
з — z	у — u	ю — yu
и } — i	ф — f	я — ya
і } — i	х — kh	ѳ — f
й — y	ц — ts	ѵ — i
к — k		

g (h) is admissible in retransliterating from the Russian foreign words such as Hugo.

Final y is to be optional when it is the second half of the diphthong *ий* (—iy) when *final and unstressed*, in such names as :

Горькій — Gor'ki,
Достоевскій — Dostoevski(y) ;

but it is obligatory when this diphthong is final and *stressed*, e.g.

ви́й — viy.

Likewise it is obligatory when this diphthong occurs medially, stressed or unstressed, e.g.

Новоросси́йскъ — Novorossiysk.

This final y is obligatory in all other diphthongs, whether medial or final, whether stressed or unstressed, e.g.

краси́вий — krasiviy.

КОЛОМЬЙКА	—	kolomïyka.
Толстой	—	Tolstoy.
край	—	kray.

The apostrophe is retained to denote the soft sign, except in names already anglicised, *e.g.* Sebastopol, Astrakhan, Archangel; but Khar'kov, Kazan', Kol'tsov.

Note of the Editors.—The earliest act of cooperation between British scholars in Russian was the recommendation of a system of transliteration, on the initiative of the School of Russian Studies in the University of Liverpool. This system was drawn up after the tabulation of schemes sent in by nearly all the principal British authorities in this subject. During the war the same question was taken up by the British Academy, which, after consultation with experts, recommended, with only a few minor modifications, the Liverpool scheme. The Conference of University Teachers, while following the same principles, has recommended a few further variations. The orthography adopted in this *Review* follows the same principles, though in some cases it has not adopted the modifications recommended at the Conference.

The main question at issue was whether the orthography practised in Central Europe should be adopted, or whether an attempt should be made to transcribe Russian direct into English equivalents. The decision was influenced by the fact that in any case Polish orthography constitutes a variant from the Central European scheme. Were this *Review* purely or primarily a philological journal, it is probable that this last named scheme would have been adopted. It is, however, in the main devoted rather to the study of Slavonic countries than to that of Slavonic languages, and one of its principal objects is to spread the knowledge of this field as widely as possible in England. It will be observed that the principal differences between the scheme adopted and the Central European scheme are as follows: $y=j$; $h=\text{v}$. h is used instead of the sign v to modify the sounds of other letters: *e.g.* $zh=\text{ž}$, $sh=\text{š}$, $ch=\text{č}$, $shch=\text{šč}$. The values of these two symbols y and h remain constant, and they give the advantage of enabling Englishmen to reach a much closer approximation to Russian pronunciation.

[NOTE.—Not being a philologist, I naturally defer to the decision of the Conference with regard to Russian transliteration; but I venture to place on record the view that that decision was reached by too exclusive attention to the *teaching* aspects of the problem, and to express the hope that at a future date it will be found possible to adopt a more uniform system of transliteration, such as will also bring us into line with the now well-nigh universal practice of continental scholars. This, in my view, can only be attained through the use of the diacritic signs already adopted in all Western Slav languages save Polish.—R. W. SETON-WATSON.]

OTHER SLAVONIC ORTHOGRAPHIES.

Czech		Serbo-Croat		
Polish.	Slovak.	Slovene.		
c	c	c	=	ts in "cats."
cz	č	č	=	ch in "church."
ć	—	ć	=	(a sound between č and tj).
ch	ch	h	=	h in "hard."
sz	š	š	=	sh in "ship."
ž	ž	ž	=	j in French "jour."
dź	—	đ, gj	=	J in "Jew."
—	d'	dj	=	d in "due."
ie	ě	je	=	y in "yet."
l	l'	lj	=	l in "collusion."
ń	ň	nj	=	n in "new."
—	ť	tj	=	t in "tune."
rz	ř	—	=	rzh.
ł	—	—	=	sound approximating w.
w	v	v	=	v in "view."

For Bulgarian the same diacritic signs are used as for Serbo-Croat.

German, Hungarian and Roumanian are transcribed each according to its own orthography.

RUSSIAN WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

1 Verst	-	-	-	=	0.66 mile.
1 Sazhen	-	-	-	=	2.33 yards.
1 Arshin	-	-	-	=	0.77 yard.
1 Square Verst	-	-	-	=	281.22 acres.
1 Desyatina	-	-	-	=	2.69 acres.
1 Vedro	-	-	-	=	2.70 gallons.
1 Chetvert	-	-	-	=	5.77 Imperial bushels.
1 Pud	-	-	-	=	0.32 cwt.
1 Funt	-	-	-	=	0.90 lb. (Avoir.)

(These calculations we owe to the courtesy of the London Chamber of Commerce, Russian Section).

TEACHERS OF RUSSIAN AND OTHER SLAVONIC
LANGUAGES IN GREAT BRITAIN.

We propose, at a later date, to print a map of Great Britain showing at which places teaching in these languages can be obtained; and we shall be glad to receive the names and addresses of any such teachers, whether in London or the provinces, of which a register will be kept for the purpose of answering any inquiries which may be addressed to us.

CONTRIBUTORS TO No. 1.

THOMAS G. MASARYK, first President of the Czechoslovak Republic, is, quite apart from his political eminence, a foremost authority on all Slavonic questions. Of capital importance is his book, *The Spirit of Russia*. As an exile during the War, he inaugurated the School of Slavonic Studies by his lecture on *The Place of Small Nations in the European Crisis*.

PETER STRUVE, Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, is a leading Russian economist and political writer. He began his career as a Marxist, but after publishing some very acute criticisms of Marx's theories he passed into the Liberal camp. He was Professor of Economics in the Polytechnical Institute of Petrograd, was for many years editor of the monthly *Russkaya Mysl* in Russia, and has recently renewed its publication abroad.

VATROSLAV JAGIĆ left Croatia as a young man owing to political reasons, and became the most eminent western Slavist since Miklosich. He was Professor of Slavonics first at Petersburg, then at Vienna University, and edited for 35 years the international *Archiv für Slawische Philologie*.

BERNARD PARES, one of the editors of this *Review*, is Professor of Russian in the University of London.

NEVILL FORBES is Professor of Slavonic Languages in the University of Oxford and is author of several books on the Russian language and on Russian history and literature.

MICHAEL GAVRILOVIĆ is Minister of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes in London, and a distinguished Serbian historian and archivist; author of the standard life of Miloš Obrenović, the first Prince of modern Serbia.

H. T. CHESHIRE is a Travelling Student of the School of Slavonic Studies and holds a scholarship of the Czechoslovak Government.

MARCU BEZA is Roumanian Consul-General in London, Lecturer in Roumanian at King's College, and author of *Papers on the Roumanian People and Literature* and various short stories and folklore studies.

A. BAYKALOV is Chairman of the British Branch of the Union of Siberian Co-operative Societies.

JOSEPH MACEK is Professor of Economics at the Commercial High School in Prague and a recognised expert on land reform.

ARNOLD DÁNIEL is a well-known Hungarian writer on sociology and rural problems, author of *Soil and Society*. He was Director of the Agricultural Museum in Budapest under the Károlyi Government (1918), but, owing to his Liberal principles, is now an exile from Hungary.

SERGIUS BULGAKOV for many years Professor of Economics in Kiev and in Moscow. He has strong philosophical interests and has paid special attention to religious questions, on which he is one of the most distinguished living Russian writers. During the Revolution he took holy orders and now ranks very high as an orthodox theologian whose modern interpretation of Christianity has had a deep influence.

ADDENDA.

(The following reached us when we had already gone to press.)

Page 5, line 15, insert after the word "State" the following sentence:—"This may serve as a practical proof of the capacity of the Slavs to form states of their own—a capacity which many German historians and politicians are fond of denying."

Page 19, line 1, as footnote to the phrase "Saint Bismarck," insert the following:—"Das heilige Wort aller Deutschen—Bismarck"—*Deutschlands Erneuerung*, August, 1921, p. 471.

THE SLAVONIC REVIEW.

VOL. I. NO. I.

JUNE 1922.

AS a result of the Great War, the English-speaking peoples were for the first time in history brought into direct and intimate relations both with Russia and the smaller Slavonic nations, then still struggling to be free. But before the new-found friendship could be cemented by time and fuller knowledge events of supreme tragedy intervened, and, so far as Russia is concerned, the obstacles to mutual understanding are for the moment greater than they ever were in the past, though at the same time the need for such an understanding is more urgent and perhaps more keenly felt. It is this fundamental fact in the present situation that encourages us to establish the *Slavonic Review*—in the first place as the organ of the School of Slavonic Studies at the University of London, King's College, but also, in a wider sense, as the organ of all those who have Slavonic sympathies or interests, and who desire to promote good relations between the English-speaking and Slavonic worlds.

The *Slavonic Review* will be devoted to the history, institutions, political and economic conditions, and also to the literature, arts, learning and philology of all the Slavonic nations, and in a lesser degree of their neighbours and associates in the former Russian Empire and in the former Dual Monarchy. It will be the joint product of British and American Slavonic scholars, and of representative Slavs in every field of intellectual effort. While maintaining the highest academic standards and assuring an impartial hearing to every school of thought, it will endeavour to keep its readers periodically informed upon all the main intellectual and political currents of modern Slav life.

THE SLAVS AFTER THE WAR.

1. A MERE glance at the map will show that to none has the war brought greater political changes than to the Slav nations. Before the war there were four Slav states: Russia, Serbia, Bulgaria and Montenegro; after the war the first three of these states changed very considerably, while Montenegro ceased to exist and two other Slav states were created, Czechoslovakia and Poland. In addition to this, several Slav provinces became semi-independent, the Ukraine receiving autonomy under Russia, and Carpathian Ruthenia under Czechoslovakia; in regard to Eastern Galicia no definite decision has as yet been reached. A single, and that the smallest, Slav nation, the Serbs of Lusatia, was not liberated and remains under German rule; but fragments of the Jugoslavs have been placed under Italian, Austrian and Greek rule, fragments of the Little Russians under Roumania, fragments of the Slovaks under Hungary, and there are small Czech and Polish minorities in Germany. There are also certain Slav minorities within the Slav states themselves; in Poland, Little Russians and Russians, and a few Czechs and Slovaks; in Czechoslovakia, Little Russians and Poles; in Jugoslavia, Bulgarians.

A great change has come about in the internal organisation of the Slav states, especially of Russia. Tsarist Russia has become a republic and moreover a communist republic. Czechoslovakia and Poland also are republics; only Serbia (Jugoslavia) and Bulgaria are monarchies. Russia has also changed from the territorial point of view; before the war it formed 54·5 per cent. of the total area of Europe, to-day it only forms 40·2 per cent. Bulgaria also is smaller than it was before the war.

2. It is often said, even to-day, that the war was a war between the Slavonic and the German worlds. The war began on account of Serbia and was therefore aimed by Germany and Austria against Russia; nevertheless, consideration for the Slavs was not the deciding motive for the entry into the war of Great Britain, America, Italy, Roumania, Japan and others. The occupation of Belgium by Germany decided Britain, and German methods of warfare provoked the decision of America. Italy,

not for the first time, made war on Austria ; Roumania's foremost aim was the attainment of national unity. It is quite impossible to say that the war was a war of Germans and Slavs. Quite apart from the fact that Bulgaria went with the Germans, both Latin and Teutonic (Anglo-Saxon) nations took part in the war against Germany. Not only the Slavs, but the whole world felt threatened by German aggression. The Slavs were certainly not the leaders, they were not the deciding factor.

Already Herder and, after him Kollár and others, prophesied the decline of Germany and the Teutonic races in general, anticipating a phase of ascendancy for the Slavs. It may be admitted that the Slav nations gained, through the war, their political independence and the possibility of successful development ; but it may also be doubted whether the development of Russia, for example, can on the whole be considered as an advance. Nor on the contrary can we say that the defeat of Germany is a decline, a final decay ; the military defeat of both Germany and Russia may in the long run prove actually beneficial, and in any case the effects of the war and its total significance are so momentous for all the nations which took part in it, that we must treat the prophecies of Kollár and Herder with due critical reserve.

3. One tremendous result of the war has been that three great monarchist empires collapsed or were transformed—Russia, Prusso-Germany and Austria-Hungary. What was left of Turkey has changed in the same direction. The old *régime* fell in the greater part of Europe. Geographically, these inherently absolutist empires were neighbours, and formed the greater part of the so-called East, *i.e.*, Eastern Europe and that Western portion of Asia which from the earliest times has had close cultural and political connection with Europe. Germany, it is true, belongs mainly to the West, but its more easterly provinces belonged to the East and formed a political whole with Austria (and even in a sense with Turkey).

The fall of the absolutist monarchies also liberated, in addition to the Slavs, the small nations lying between the Germans and the Russians. I have already called attention¹ to the zone of small nations extending from the Arctic Sea in the North to the island of Crete in the South. Europe falls politically, and to a great extent also culturally, into three very distinct sections. In the West we have five larger nations and states—Britain, France,

¹ In *The Problem of Small Nations in the European Crisis* (London, 1915) and in *The New Europe* (privately printed in London, Christmas 1918, and afterwards published in a revised Czech edition).—ED.

Germany, Italy and Spain; there are only three small states—Portugal, Belgium and Holland—the small nations of the West consisting of the Portuguese, the Dutch (and Flemish), and various Celtic and Basque fragments. In the East again, we have the huge territory of Russia, but in between the two groups there is a whole series of small nations (to-day for the most part states also): Finland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Roumania, Jugoslavia, Greece, Bulgaria, Hungary, Albania. Six of these nations, Finland, Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Czechoslovakia, were liberated by the Great War, while Roumania, Jugoslavia and Greece were greatly enlarged. The situation of the Ukraine, White Russia and, properly speaking, of Lithuania also, is not yet definitive. (The Lapp fragment in Scandinavia hardly need be included in this survey).

4. If I begin my review of the individual Slav nations and states with Czechoslovakia, this is merely because I am better acquainted with the conditions here than in other Slavonic countries. Moreover a description of conditions in Czechoslovakia will facilitate the comprehension of conditions in other Slav countries, since there are many analogies between them.

Czechoslovakia is a revival of the former Bohemian (and Great Moravian) state. Originally the Czechs were united in one state with the Slovaks, but the latter, on the arrival of the Magyars in ancient Pannonia, fell for centuries under foreign rule. The Czechs and Slovaks are one nation and have one language. The Czechs were far more free to develop their language than the Slovaks, and thus it happened that the latter have preserved their older dialect, which they use as a written language. But there is not and cannot be any linguistic question between Czechs and Slovaks.

Czechoslovakia has this peculiarity, that it comprises within its borders considerable minorities, particularly of Germans. Besides the Germans, there is a considerable percentage of Magyars, some Poles, and a fairly large number of Little Russians or Ruthenes in Slovakia, quite apart from those in the autonomous province of Carpathian Ruthenia. This national composition of the state has given rise to the dispute as to whether Czechoslovakia is a national state or a state made up of several nations. The Czechs uphold the first view, the Germans and others the second. Very often play is made with the ethnographic fiction that the Slovaks are a nation entirely distinct from the Czechs, and thus the impression is created that the state hardly has a uniform

Slav majority at all. This, however, is an argument confined to unscientific political polemics against Czechoslovakia. But the important fact remains that Czechoslovakia has a considerable German minority along the frontiers of Germany, and it is necessary that this minority should be won over to the state.

The original Bohemian state was founded by the Czechs, and the present revived Czechoslovak state is also the joint work of the Czechs and Slovaks. The Germans of Bohemia, both during and after the war, were opposed to the Allies and also to the formation of the new Republic; while in the old days when Bohemia first arose, the Germans were not yet in the country. It is pointed out on the Czech side that the Germans were colonists, in order to establish the fact that Bohemia was founded by the present majority of the Slav population and that it endured as a Slav state; it is further pointed out that the Germans always recognised the Bohemian Kingdom, being content with the equality of rights granted to them. It is true that in recent times they did not recognise the continuity or historical "state rights" of Bohemia within the Austrian Empire; there was, however, a time when they did recognise this right.

The problem of nationalities and languages is extremely difficult of solution. It can be formulated as follows:—How to form a unitary state, that is, one enjoying political and administrative unity; and how to harmonise political centralisation with that administrative autonomy which is admittedly so desirable? Czechoslovakia has a special Ministry of Unification whose concern it is to unify legislation, since the Czech countries have retained Austrian law, while Slovakia and Carpathian Ruthenia are still subject to the Hungarian legal code.

Internationally, Czechoslovakia has its own special function because it is, in the literal sense of the word, the geographical heart of Europe. It has common political boundaries with Germany and Austria, with the Poles, the Little Russians and, finally, with the Magyars. Of its minorities, the Germans, the Magyars, the Poles and the Little Russians are parts of neighbouring nations. (The Roumanian minority in Ruthenia is quite insignificant, forming only a few villages.)

The revived state was faced by a formidable cultural problem in Slovakia and Ruthenia, as a result of the Magyars having repressed all national education and literature in those districts. Particularly since the Apponyi Education Acts of 1907, Slovak education had been virtually abolished, since the few hundred denominational schools which still survived were only nominally

Slovak. To-day there are in Slovakia more than 2,600 new Slovak national elementary schools; over 80 grammar schools (*Bürgerschulen*); over 30 secondary schools and also the beginnings of its own university. In Ruthenia also there are already about 700 Ruthene elementary schools, in addition to grammar and secondary schools and also infant schools. Moreover the Republic is also turning its attention to the hygienic improvement of this much neglected country; state hospitals are being established, and epidemic and endemic diseases are being stamped out. It may be said without exaggeration that the cultural policy here pursued by Czechoslovakia has few parallels in the New Europe. The Czech nation under the oppressive rule of Austria distinguished itself by a great cultural effort, and it is in this spirit that the educational policy of the new state is being carried out. Moravia has also obtained its own university.

All the national minorities have their schools; the Germans, by reason of their numbers and their high development, have in addition their own university, two Technical High Schools and an agricultural academy (this latter established by the Republic).

In Czechoslovakia there is a strong religious movement. With political liberty, the old Hussite reforming tendencies, suppressed by the Habsburgs, have revived. Hussitism appears most clearly in the formation of the so-called "Czechoslovak Church," which comprises several hundred thousand members.

The Protestant minority—under which form Hussitism and the Brotherhood were preserved under Austrian rule—was divided into Lutherans and Calvinists (Reformed Church); after the revolution they united and considerably increased their membership through the conversion of Catholics. In recent times a movement has also appeared similar to English and American Unitarianism. The foreign churches, such as the Baptists, Methodists and others, have now free access to the country.

In Slovakia there is a considerable Lutheran minority also deriving from the Hussite reformation; the majority of the Slovaks are Catholic. The Hussite religious movement has not as yet made itself felt in Slovakia. In Ruthenia, which is predominantly Uniate, there is a movement in favour of Orthodoxy in about 40 villages.

By the unification of Slovakia and Ruthenia with the Czech countries, the number of Jews has been increased. Among the Jews we can see a fairly strong nationalist and Zionist current; in Carpathian Ruthenia most Jews adhere to

orthodoxy, as in Poland and Russia; and this is also true, though to a lesser degree, of the Jews in Slovakia.

Czechoslovakia shows a considerable religious and ecclesiastical activity, and differs in this from the other Slav nations, in which church membership has become identified with nationality. The Serbs oppose their Orthodoxy to Islam and Austrian Catholicism. The Poles, as a predominantly Catholic nation, are opposed, in their religion, to Orthodoxy and Protestantism and consequently to the Russians and Germans. Russian and Orthodox have always gone together. In Bohemia, again, Hussitism and the Brotherhood were the national church, when only one-tenth of the nation remained Catholic. The policy of forcible re-conversion to Catholicism which was actively pursued by the Habsburgs at the period of the counter-reformation, was only really reversed by the revolution in 1918: and the already mentioned "Czechoslovak Church" is by its programme an effort to reorganise the former national church. The national character of a church, however, is not determined merely by the numbers of its members, but, above all, by its internal quality. In Slovakia the Lutheran church became in a certain measure national, in opposition to Magyar Calvinism and to the official political misuse of Catholicism.

Czechoslovakia has to cope with very difficult economic problems. Industry in the old Austria was in many branches predominantly Bohemian; but since the Czech state has a population of only about 14 millions, as against 51 in Austria-Hungary, its industry must seek new outlets, being disproportionately developed for the home markets. Czechoslovakia, therefore, is in the same position as the Western nations and naturally tends to direct its exports principally towards the East.

Czechoslovak agriculture has reached a considerable degree of development, and it would be easy for it to supply the whole population of the state with bread and meat. The state has undertaken a great agrarian reform, because both the Czech countries and also Slovakia and Ruthenia were countries of large estates. These estates point clearly to the aristocratic organisation of the old Austria-Hungary and to the subjugation of the Slav nations by the Germans and Magyars. In the Czech lands the cruel confiscation of estates, which accompanied the counter-reformation, increased the aristocracy's excessive holding in land.

Economic and political consolidation necessitates a considerable improvement in the means of communication. The railways built by Austria-Hungary in the sole interest of the

centres of Vienna and Budapest, must be supplemented by new transversal lines to link up the various provinces of the Republic, which are unusually long and narrow. Special attention must be paid to the rivers, especially to the Elbe, the Danube and their tributaries. Connecting canals are also necessary.

With economic development is bound up the development of the political parties and especially the growth of Socialism and Agrarianism. Soon after the revolution the Socialists (Marxists and National Socialists) had a majority in the government. But subsequent developments and especially the cleavage caused in the Socialist ranks by the influence of Russian Bolshevism, weakened the influence of Labour and of Social Democracy. Next to the socialist parties the strongest political party is the Agrarian; this reflects the fact that the Republic is half industrial, half agricultural. The revolution also strengthened the Catholic party—a proof that the Habsburg guardianship of the Church did the Church itself little service. In the last rank stands the party of National Democracy, representing the political organisation of the bourgeoisie, in which the intellectuals form the determining element. Capitalism has not, as yet, assumed as large dimensions as in western countries.

5. *Poland* has the same task of political and administrative unification. The Polish nation was cut into three by its adversaries, and in each section—the Prussian, Russian and Austrian—different laws and customs were in force. As against this, however, there was a strong national consciousness in every part, and a desire for union strengthened by the revolutionary tradition and the attempts to establish Polish independence in the time of Napoleon.

Poland also has considerable minorities, but of a different character from those in Czechoslovakia. Indeed, speaking generally, it must be pointed out that every question of minorities and nationalities has its own peculiar character and content, and must be judged separately and solved on its own merits.

The religious situation in Poland may be characterised by the statement that within its present territory approximately only 60 per cent. of the population is Catholic, the remaining 40 per cent. being Orthodox, Protestant and Jewish, or as regards nationality, Little Russians, Russians, Germans and others.

Poland borders in the west and south on Germany, Czechoslovakia and Roumania; in the north and east on the "Border States," Lithuania and Latvia and on White Russia and the

Ukraine. Among these neighbours also the religious question plays a considerable part: the Lithuanians are Catholic, the Letts and Germans Protestant.

As regards relations with the Germans, it is to be noted that the Poles have as neighbours only the North Germans, whereas Czechoslovakia borders with both North and South Germans, the Slovenes and Croats with the South Germans only. The difference between North and South Germans had in the past and still has a certain political importance. The Russians, Serbs and Bulgars have no German neighbours, though, of course, the old Russia, as a State, had a common political boundary with Prusso-Germany and had German colonies of its own. In attempting to estimate the new relations between Germans and Poles we may note such publications as the book by Hermann Koetzschke, *Die deutsche Polenfreundschaft*, which tries to prove that the relations of Germans and Poles have in the main been friendly. But such voices are rare, and on the other hand, many influential adversaries of the Poles adhere to the old programme which assigns to the Germans the task of colonising the East, or rather the South-east. This, of course, affects in the first instance the Poles and the Czechs.

Certain difficulties with Polish minorities arise out of the fact that the question of the Ukraine and also those of Lithuania and White Russia are not yet finally settled.

Polish economic difficulties have also a peculiar character of their own. It must be remembered that Poland suffered greatly in the war. The country is for the most part agricultural, industry being confined to a few centres, chiefly in the west. Polish industry must endeavour to find an outlet Eastwards; indeed even under Tsarist rule the manufacturers of Russian Poland had Russia and Siberia as their objective. The coal deposits are rich. Poland has a direct outlet to the sea at Danzig, which Czechoslovakia has not.

6. For the *Jugoslavs* also, who form a national and linguistic unit, political and administrative unification is a difficult problem. The Yugoslav nation was of all Slavonic nations the most dismembered; and in Yugoslavia, to-day, no fewer than five legal systems—the Serbian, Montenegrin, Hungarian, Austrian and Turkish—are still in force. There are a number of minorities—Magyar, German, Roumanian, Italian, Albanian, Turkish and Bulgarian—but these are smaller in relation to the total population than in Poland or Czechoslovakia.

The difference between the Orthodox (Serb) and the Catholic

(Croat and Slovene) districts of the united state, is politically serious; the old conflict between Croats and Serbs continues since the achievement of unity. As elsewhere, the chief problem is to find an equilibrium between the centralising tendency towards unity and the administrative tendency towards autonomy—in other words, between general policy and local interests.

Jugoslavia has many neighbours: Germans, Magyars, Roumanians, Greeks, Bulgarians, Italians, Albanians and Turks; on the west the Adriatic provides a natural boundary. The country is agricultural and this is, in the transition stage, a certain advantage for unification. The construction of means of communication is an urgent task not only economically but also for the unification of so large a territory. Jugoslavia has at its disposal the Adriatic Sea, the ports of which are about to be improved; there are many such ports and they are very good.

7. *Bulgaria* has much simpler conditions than Jugoslavia, though there are national minorities, notably the Turkish. As neighbours Bulgaria has Serbs, Roumanians, Greeks and Turks. The relation with Serbia is the most serious. Between these Slav nations before the world-war there was a dispute and an armed conflict over Macedonia; and the alliance of Bulgaria with the Central Powers sharpened the animosity. On both sides, however, an increasing number of voices are calling for an understanding between the Serbs and the Bulgars, and it is argued that the two nations could form, and ought to form, a federation. By this means the unification of all Southern Slavs would be achieved for the first time.

Economically Bulgaria, like Serbia, is a predominantly agricultural country, and this provides an advantageous basis for the understanding between the two nations. Bulgaria has a coastline on the Black Sea, but is less favourably situated than are the Jugoslavs upon the Adriatic. The Danube has a very considerable significance: the great stream is equally important for Roumania and Jugoslavia.

8. As a result of the war and the revolution, *Russia* has undergone greater changes than any other Slavonic state. It became smaller in territory, as a result of the Border nations, especially on the west, attaining independence. But the most far-reaching change was the removal of the Tsarist autocracy and the establishment of a communist republic. Russia is the first Socialist state in Europe and in the world generally, and on this account became an object of universal interest.

In Europe Russia borders upon Finland, Esthonia, Latvia,

Poland and Roumania. Her relations to the Ukraine and White Russia are vague; the same is true of her relations to the nations and states of the Caucasus.

Before the war, Russia and Prusso-Germany had for hundreds of years maintained close neighbourly relations; and although, through the changes of the war, the two countries are separated from each other territorially, none the less the relation of Russia to Prussia, and, indeed to Germany as a whole, is most important, especially from the economic point of view. Agricultural Russia can be supplied by industrial Germany with manufactured products and direct communication is facilitated by the sea, so that transit through the Border States can be eliminated.

When the peace of Brest-Litovsk between Germany and Russia was concluded, the *Morning Post* wrote: "The Slav becomes the slave of the German; that is the meaning of the German-Russian peace." Since that time the possibility of an economic penetration of Russia by Germany has been very seriously considered in the West. The Germans themselves pay diligent attention to Russia, and, therefore, among German publicists those voices deserve special attention which look forward to friendship with Russia as specially calculated to strengthen East Prussia.¹ At the moment of writing comes the news of the Russo-German understanding in Genoa.

Russia, having suffered greatly from the war and the revolution, stands in urgent need of economic restoration, in agriculture no less than in industry. Russia is dependent on Western capital and on the assistance of Western engineers, workmen, merchants and so on.

The cultural tasks awaiting her are equally great and urgent: to abolish the great percentage of illiterates and to raise the general level of education. It is doubtful whether and in what measure the Russian Orthodox church will be able to take part in the educational tasks of the nation. Hitherto it has leant towards an exaggerated transcendentalism, and its active share in the education of the people has been insignificant. By its transcendentalism the church had become the slave of Tsarism; but owing to the revolution an improvement has been effected, in that it has returned to the patriarchal organisation of the period before Peter the Great, and that, through the persecution of the priests by the Bolshevists, it has drawn nearer to the peasant masses.

¹ e.g., See Karl Fischer, *Das ostpreussische Problem* and A. von Batocki *Ostpreussens wirtschaftliche Lage vor und nach dem Weltkrieg*.

Only a few words are necessary in this connection on Bolshevism: for Bolshevism is often criticised as a Slav phenomenon. The Russian Bolsheviks themselves hold that they are the real, and the only real, Marxists: and indeed when they seized control of the government, they did so in the firm conviction that their revolution, conducted in accordance with Marxist theory, would introduce a communist *régime* into Russia, and that the West would follow Russia's example and would abandon capitalism. Thanks to continual discussions carried on between Socialists and non-Socialists, the matter has, I think, been made sufficiently clear. Neither in its teaching nor in its tactics is Bolshevism Marxist. Bolshevism certainly has some Marxist elements, but it is rather a mixture of Blanquism, Syndicalism and Anarchism: it is much more akin to Bakunin than to Marx. It is the continuation of Russian Nihilism and especially of terroristic Nihilism. The product is a purely Russian phenomenon, the fruit of an inorganic development caused by the impact of the most radical western ideas upon the stationary outlook on the world so long upheld by the Russian Church. The Bolshevik is the Russian monk, excited and confused by Feuerbach's materialism and atheism. Half-education was the scourge of old Russia and is the scourge of Soviet Russia. A nation, mostly illiterate, cannot work out the Marxian Socialist doctrine except on paper. But that an uncultured or half-cultured nation should have succumbed so completely to the Bolshevistic Utopia need cause much less surprise, since it was thrown by the war and revolution into great material and moral distress. For similar reasons Bolshevism, although in a milder form, appeared in other Slav nations, among the Jugoslavs and Bulgars and in Czechoslovakia. As in Russia, so in Germany and Hungary Bolshevism was conditioned by the war; it arose precisely in countries which had lost the war or suffered severely from its effects. This, in itself, tends to prove that Russian Bolshevism is not the definitive stage in human development which Marx expected and foretold. And similarly it is clear that Bolshevism did not arise in Russia only and that it is not therefore in its whole essence Russian and Slav; all that can be said is that Russian Bolshevism has a peculiar character of its own. The so-called "dictatorship of the proletariat" is the absolutist domination of an inconsiderable minority: willy nilly, the Bolsheviks continue the Tsarist autocracy.

Politically and administratively, Russian Bolshevism has

changed quickly enough in its short existence. Owing to the Revolution the centralistic Tsarist organisation collapsed, and Russia split into separate, mutually independent communities. Soon, however, Bolshevism made an attempt at centralisation, and to-day Russia is a federation of more or less independent and autonomous states and territories (in all, twenty-five—the Ukraine, Kazan, etc.). An enormous empire at the agricultural stage of development splits more easily into separate, more or less self-sufficing units. It is this Russian lack of unity which since the Great War, just as at earlier periods of history, enabled individuals possessing political and military power to obtain control both of the parts and of the whole. From the economic point of view Bolshevism has changed no less quickly, reverting always more and more to capitalism and individualism.

The question how far the Russians and the Slavs in general are inclined to Communism, is a complicated and difficult one. Soviet Communism, properly viewed, is at most a kind of State Capitalism: in reality it is an altogether negative Communism, poverty and distress being the main things held in common. According to the teaching of Marx and of all Communists, the Communist *régime* should be something higher than the Capitalist, and should therefore be both economically and socially more efficient. This is certainly not true of the Soviet system, which in economic matters is more anarchic than democratic in character, and resembles the anarchic communism which prevailed among the revolutionary emigrant committees during the Tsarist period.

The social and religious movement which arose in Bohemia after the martyrdom of John Huss also assumed in its extreme Taborite form a communist character; but it was a religious communism, based upon the teaching of the Acts of the Apostles. Political and economic disorder also facilitated the Taborite experiment, but it remained localised and was of short duration. Moreover, this religious communism existed then not only in Bohemia, but also in Germany (the Anabaptists of Münster) and is to be found even to-day in the United States. Speaking broadly, we may ascribe the present Soviet *régime* far rather to the political and social chaos which has overtaken a culturally weak nation, than to any inherent Slav quality; nor has any one so far succeeded in establishing its purely Slav origin.

The anarchic character of Soviet Russia has been admitted: and we are told to regard anarchism also as an essential feature of the Slav character. But setting aside the fact that anarchism

is also found among Western nations—perhaps more among the Latins of Celtic admixture than among the Teutonic races—the so-called Slav anarchism must be explained rather as the result of the temporary conditions under which the Slavs lived. Almost all of them came at a relatively early date under foreign rule; having been excluded alike from political and administrative control, they naturally lack continuity and tradition in both these directions. This also applies to the Bolshevists, who came into power through the revolution. They are ex-piating in their own persons, and in that of the Russian nation, the sins of the Tsarist *régime*, which had not taught and accustomed the people to take part in the political and social administration. The Bolshevists add to this the error of their historical materialism, as a result of which they laid insufficient stress on the organisation of the state and its administration, to which theoretically also they paid no attention. This, however, is the weak spot of Marxist Socialism in Germany also, and indeed everywhere. In all Slavonic nations we thus observe what may be called practical anarchism, or more properly “Astatism”: it is a serious defect, of which all Slav nations must become conscious. Of course, among the Teutonic peoples—and especially in Prussia—the very opposite of Astatism, namely Statism (*Étatisme*) prevailed, even to an exaggerated degree: but this in turn had pernicious effects, both upon politics and upon culture, and indeed, Germany fell because of her exaggerated “Statism.”

All these problems would demand a more detailed and exact analysis: I am well aware that the explanation of political and social changes in various nations by supposed quasi-permanent national and racial qualities must be accepted with very great caution in the present state of sociological knowledge.

9. The *Ukraine* has already been mentioned several times; its political situation and especially its relation to Soviet Russia are as yet ill defined. The root of the Ukrainian problem is how far the difference between the Ukraine and Russia will become stereotyped. Economically, the Ukraine differs from northern Russia; it has a richer soil, and, indeed, it grew the greater part of the corn exported from Russia before the war. It possesses coal, iron and petroleum—for instance, the Galician oil-fields are situated in territory inhabited by Little Russians—and it has the sea. Precisely for this reason the Russians from the north pressed down towards the Ukrainian south. There are also differences of character between the Russians and Ukrainians

analogous to the difference between the Northerner and Southerner among other nations.

Up to the present there has been a dispute among Slavonic philologists and scholars generally, as to whether Little Russian is a different language from Russian proper, or only a Russian dialect. Such a dispute cannot, of course, be solved on exclusively grammatical lines: for in nearly all nations the supremacy of the literary language has been determined by political supremacy. To-day, Ukrainian literature is still weak compared with the Russian; Kiev, the largest town in the Ukraine, is Russian in character, and was the cradle of the Russian state as a whole.

The Little Russian people overflows into the neighbouring countries—Russia, Poland Carpathian Ruthenia and Roumania—their number being estimated at 30 millions. Hence, various political issues between Russia, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Roumania. The territory inhabited by the Little Russians is as large as Germany and contains a larger population than France.

10. The question which has been put in regard to the Ukrainians applies to a still greater degree to the White Russians—that is to say, whether they are a separate nation and have a separate language. As these two instances show, the language question often assumes a special significance in places where a many-sided and vigorous intellectual life is still lacking. It is just among these nations and fragments of nations that very trifling linguistic differences are more clearly perceived, and men cling to peculiarities which are often of purely local character. On the other hand it cannot be denied that the literary use of a popular language or even dialect has a good influence upon the intellectual development; the extreme centralism prevalent in Russia was less harmful culturally than politically, and actually provoked the movement for Ukrainian cultural autonomy. In Hungary the Magyars were against the Czech literary language, but they tolerated the Slovak popular dialect. It is easy to see that politically this development of local dialects and cultures may involve a weakening of the nation; Germany has preserved a central literary language, though possessing many dialects which differ very materially from it; this applies to a still greater extent to France, and France is also cited as an example of political centralisation.

11. We have reviewed the situation of the various Slav nations, and the question now presents itself: What have they in common,

or rather have they enough in common to justify us in speaking of the Slavs and of Slavdom as an organic cultural and even political whole? We are thus confronted with the old question of *Pan-Slavism*.

The fact that through the war the Slav nations have been liberated and recognised, leads naturally to the question of Pan-Slavism. And there are among the individual Slav nations various theorists and politicians who urge upon them all a Slavonic or Pan-Slav policy. On the other hand we hear it said that Pan-Slavism reached its aim in the war—that it has done its work. The German scholar Diels, who expresses this opinion in a recent volume on the Slav nations, and is of course sufficiently prejudiced against them, shares the German official view of Pan-Slavism as the motive power of the old Russia and the Slavs in general, both in the World War itself and in the period preceding it.

The Slav nations, although each has an ancient literature peculiar to itself, have nevertheless preserved many common linguistic traits which serve as natural links binding them together. A comparison of the Slavonic group of languages with the Latin or Germanic groups shows that the Slavs are linguistically more closely allied among themselves than are the Teutons or Latins; they easily understand one another, and this is a considerable advantage for literary and practical intercourse. I base this verdict, not upon a philological training, but simply on a practical knowledge of Slav languages and literatures.

Geographically the Slavs do not form a perfect whole, since the Roumanians and Magyars separate the northern from the southern group. But in this respect the Slavs are no worse off than the Latins, and still more the Germans. Proximity has rendered possible very close relations between the different Slav nations—and of course not invariably friendly relations. The unitary character of the Slavonic nations is, to a great extent, the outcome of similarity in the degree of culture, of economic and spiritual culture generally. The Czechs alone (this applies somewhat less to the Slovaks) are on a cultural level more closely resembling that of the Western nations.

How far, apart from these factors, we can speak of an affinity resulting from national and racial, physical and spiritual qualities, it is hard to decide. Scientifically, so far as I can see, practically no precise conclusions have been reached on this point. There remains only the historical fact, that the Slavonic nations in dim prehistoric ages formed a single whole, which became slowly

differentiated both linguistically and culturally. In historic times the Slav nations developed rather along parallel lines than under the influence of mutual interaction and permeation. Their history up to now is above all a history of the influence of foreign neighbours—Byzantine, Roman, German, Finnish, Tartar and Turkish.

The fact that the Slavonic nations have now been liberated and politically reorganised does not strengthen political Pan-Slavism. For precisely as a consequence of its liberation each has been set separate tasks of reconstruction, in which its kinsmen can only render very limited assistance. We, for instance, can export to Jugoslavia, Poland, Russia, and Bulgaria the products of our industry, but the Germans and others can do the same. In buying and selling, linguistic and national affinity is not decisive. Cultural assistance can also be furnished to the different Slav nations by the Western nations. On the other hand, Czechoslovakia, for example, has its own special tasks which it must perform by its own mental and physical forces. It has to effect the unification of Slovakia with the Czech lands, the improvement of Ruthenia, and an understanding with the Polish minority—three specifically Slavonic tasks set within a single state. The Poles have a difficult problem in the ordering of their relations with the Russians and Little Russians, while the Russians and Jugoslavs have also their own special Slavonic tasks, both as regards their neighbours and their own Slavonic minorities.

Moreover, the chaos in Russia has resulted in a special form of reciprocity and mutual intercourse among all Slavs (which may of course prove to be only temporary). There are considerable colonies of Russian exiles in Czechoslovakia, Jugoslavia and Poland. In Prague a Russian university and secondary school have been established, and also an Ukrainian university. Czechoslovakia has also been drawn nearer to Russia during the war by its Legions. At the same time, however, a large Russian emigration exists in Berlin, in Paris and Rome, in England and America, and indeed almost everywhere, and its members are strengthening their relations with the Western nations.

Culturally the Russians and all the Slavs are driven as before the war to a solidarity with the Western nations. Their relations to the German nation are especially important, on the one hand on account of their proximity, and on the other because of the minorities. What Germany is for the Northern Slavs, Italy is for the Southern Slavs. But though of course proximity counts for much, economic relations are also decisive. To-day, for ex-

ample, the exchange has this effect, that students from Jugoslavia or from the Baltic states can live more cheaply in Germany than in France or England. Thus, even after the war, Germany exerts an influence on her Slavonic neighbours, although through the war, French, British and American influence with all Slavs has considerably increased.

In a political sense Pan-Slavism would involve some leadership, presumably that of the largest Slavonic nation. But Russia in its present decay is debarred from such a task for a long period of time, perhaps for generations; and as in Russia all the parties of progress, by reason of their opposition to official nationalism, were non-national or even anti-national,¹ there is no prospect of any general agreement in favour of a Pan-Slavist policy. The Pan-Slavism of the conservative or the reactionary parties will be desired by no one. Next to the Russians, the Little Russians and Poles are the largest Slav nations; but the Ukraine is quite unprepared to take a leading part, while the Poles are, on principle, opposed to any Pan-Slavist policy.

If we take a general view of the internal situation of the Slav nations, we are led to the conclusion that, for a long time to come, Pan-Slavism can only be the cultural and moral power which it was before the war. Kollár's programme of Slav reciprocity is under the new conditions more practical than it was in his own day. It may be objected that a partial Pan-Slavism already exists in the Little Entente and the understanding between Czechoslovakia and Poland. But the Little Entente also includes the Roumanians, while between Poland and Czechoslovakia sharp conflicts have arisen; there are, moreover, disputes between Serbs and Bulgars, and within the individual Slav states. But it may be admitted that already through the war the Slav nations have been drawn a good deal closer to one another and that the post-war situation invites them to mutual assistance and understanding. Pan-Germanism and the *Drang nach Osten* naturally rallied together and threatened the Slav nations; hence to-day the main question is how Pan-Germanism will develop, and what will be the attitude of the German nation towards its Slav neighbours. The Pan-Germans do not forget easily; individuals and nations are guided by habit, and to unlearn a lesson is a difficult process; even after the war the Pan-Germans preach the gospel of

¹ We do not think that this statement can be accepted as to the Octobrists, the Cadets or the Socialist Revolutionaries; indeed it seems to us that there is much nationalism in the Mensheviks, and even in the Bolsheviks—ED.

Saint Bismarck ! Even the more moderate political parties and tendencies direct the German nation to the east and south-east. For example, they repeat the watchword that Germany must be the advance guard (*Vormacht*) of the Greater East; or again we hear that the Germans will be the colonisers, the champions and the advance-guard (*Wortführer* and *Schwertträger*) of the countries between the North Sea and the Pacific. Yet we are also told that the war will have had an important—perhaps its most important—result, in that it will have rendered possible a peaceful co-operation between Germans and Slavs. The German *Drang nach Osten*, it is said, cannot cease at once, but it will change into a peaceful co-operation, at most into friendly emulation. It is not my task to characterise the German point of view in regard to the relation between Germany and the Slavs; it is only necessary to call attention to the fact that German publicists and political thinkers are studying the Slav nations very carefully, and that great attention is paid to the study of Slavdom. I have noted in proof of this that eighteen universities in Germany have announced, for the coming summer session, lectures on all branches of Slavonic literature, history, ethnography, philology, &c. Special diligence is devoted to the study of Russia. In Western countries, in France, Britain and Italy it is true that more attention is now paid to Slavonic problems than formerly, but still infinitely less than in Germany.

The German nation is the largest in Europe next to the Russian. Germany has to-day a German population of 61, Austria of 6, Switzerland of 2½ millions, while the German minorities in the neighbouring states (Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Jugoslavia, Roumania) make up about 6 millions more. Thus there are approximately about 76 million Germans altogether in Europe, on a high level of culture and capacity. It is only natural that the smaller Slav nations, some of whom, though highly talented, have till lately been fatally hampered in their cultural development, should contemplate a *rapprochement* and union against possible German aggression in the future.

The Slavs were estimated before the war as about 150 millions. At present we have no official census of all the Slav nations and I therefore quote the figures given by Prof. Niederle for the year 1900.

Russians (with Little Russians and White Russians)	94,000,000
Poles - - - - -	20,000,000
Czechs and Slovaks - - - - -	9,800,000
Serbs, Croats and Slovenes - - - - -	10,050,000

Bulgars -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,000,000
Lusatian Serbs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	150,000
									<hr/>
									139,000,000
									<hr/>

By 1910 the same authority estimates them to have increased to 156,000,000. In any case the Slavs make up more than a third of the population of Europe; if united, they would be the largest nation and state. As against the Germans, the Slav minorities in the neighbouring non-Slavonic states are relatively smaller than the German minorities in the Slav states; and indeed the largest Slavonic minority—the Little Russians in Poland—is in a Slavonic state.

12. The conditions resulting from the war summon all the nations of Europe to solidarity and unity; and I believe that the United States of Europe are developing.

This new Europe will develop slowly and piecemeal. As an initial stage, closer understandings will arise here and there among individual nations. We still have the group of the Big Entente, which despite economic and political controversies between individual members, nevertheless constitutes a recognised international authority. We have further the Little Entente, and the understanding reached by Czechoslovakia with Poland and with Austria: while at the same time attempts are being made to bring together Poland and the small Baltic states, and the various Caucasian states in the south of Russia are also drawing together. Everywhere we see efforts towards unity. The League of Nations is working in the same direction, and the International Conferences of Washington, Cannes and Genoa must also be mentioned; Germany and Russia have just concluded an alliance.

The relations between France and Germany are of course strained, since the excitement and antipathies of the war have not yet entirely disappeared. But in Germany and France alike the voices calling for an understanding are increasing. Designs of expansion are imputed to France, and it is not sufficiently realised how severely France suffered, even though victorious. The need for the economic restoration of Russia and Germany is acknowledged; but France has suffered no less than Russia, since the war was fought principally on French (and Belgian) territory. Germany has not been damaged by the war, not having been the battlefield. It is from this point of view that France and her policy—especially towards reparations—must be judged; the war damaged not only the vanquished but also the victors. We

must clearly realise that it is not only Russia and Germany which need to be restored, but also France and, not less, Belgium; nor must we forget Poland and Serbia—also countries which were fought over and ravaged.

Many years before the war there was in France a very promising movement in literature, politics and philosophy, known as "The New France." Perhaps its most significant name is Romain Rolland, and beside him there is quite a series of thinkers, poets and artists who worked for a moral renaissance of France and a closer union with Europe. Whether these men had a clear programme for the political unity of Europe, is not important. What is really important, is that they should have laid the moral and philosophical foundations, upon which an organic union of the civilised nations of Europe can rest. The war caused much damage in this moral sphere, but it may be hoped that the aspirations and tendencies of Romain Rolland, Suarès, Péguy and others will bear fruit in post-war France. In Germany also, though perhaps more modestly, prominent men are professing an all-embracing international and European creed.

National desires are to a large extent satisfied by the post-war organisation of Europe. It is true that Europe is not organised completely in accord with the principle of nationality, but the present-day States already correspond to the principle of nationality sufficiently closely to render war for national motives unnecessary. National minorities will be safeguarded everywhere in their cultural development, and all nations will draw closer together; disputed questions can be everywhere settled by agreement, without wars. National sentiments will not be replaced by internationalism, which owes its origin to the solidarity of nations; but the individual national programme will become more positive, the love of one's own nation will be less troubled by antagonism, or even hatred and contempt towards other nations. True nationalism will remain, but national hatred will disappear.

There is no fear that the so-called "Balkanisation" of Europe may prevent closer relations between the nations. In this respect, many Americans and Englishmen, accustomed to territorial conditions such as present no difficulties in regard to languages and communications, express exaggerated apprehension in regard to the small States. Europe has exactly the same number of nations as before, although the war has brought several new small States into existence. But this very fact means that national aspirations have in the main been satisfied, and that the

path now lies open towards internationalism and solidarity. Russia, Austria and Prusso-Germany were, it is true, only three states, but they were states in which a whole series of nations was oppressed. It is just this oppression that was one of the principal causes of the war : and hence the so-called Balkanisation of Europe marks a higher stage of development. Naturally the internal organisation of these new states and indeed of Europe generally, is an extremely difficult task : but the difficulties can here be overcome by sensible and energetic statesmen and nations. The United States of Europe demand thought and effort. The difficulties and unfavourable conditions from which Europe is suffering have not been created through the fault of the new states, but far rather of the so-called " Big States," of the old imperialistic type.

13. The unification of Europe will be completed and extended by the unification of all mankind. The war united Europe with America and Asia, consolidated the Anglo-Saxon states and brought them nearer to the nations of the Far East. Through the war the nations have begun to realise that they all form an organic whole. Through the war the humanitarian programme, that is the programme of the most advanced brains among all the nations, has been reinforced. Man cannot have any other programme than the welfare of man. The humanitarian programme means sympathy with all men, in spite of differences of language, nationality and class, and at the same time a conscious effort for the unification of all mankind. This humanitarian programme will be realised by the union of the states of Europe, and there is good hope that the Slavonic nations will by their own solidarity contribute towards this end.

The European problem is not merely one of organisation, which is, after all, a mechanical activity. We organise what already exists, we organise old things ; but to-day the nations have not only to organise, but above all to create. Everywhere the old régime, the old men, must give way to the new.

This task is only too often understood in a narrow and one-sided fashion ; by the restoration of the nations and of Europe is generally meant the economic and political restoration of states. I do not think that I am lacking in appreciation either for economics or for the State, when I say that society, if it is to be perfect, must rest both politics and economics on a basis of culture : for all nations need instruction and education, and need to unlearn old lessons. We have to do here not only with the spread and increase of knowledge ; the German nation had a very

efficient school system, and it used to be said that the German teacher won Germany her battles. But this very teacher has now been defeated, nor has organising ability availed to save Germany. Mere intellectualism is not the education and the moral revival of which all nations now stand in need.

Our Czech national king, George Poděbrad, preached and upheld a programme of eternal peace among the nations, and he did this after the Hussite wars had shaken the Europe of his day. The war of 1914 has shaken not only all Europe, but all mankind : and I firmly believe that rarely in all history has there been a more favourable occasion for the realisation of such ideals as inspired that early programme of King George. For indeed ideals such as these must be the final goal of effort for every individual and for every nation.

THOMAS G. MASARYK.

RUSSIA.

CES serfs, à mesure qu'ils recevront la liberté, se trouveront placés entre des instituteurs plus que suspects et des prêtres sans force et sans considération. Ainsi exposés, sans préparation ils passeront infailliblement et brusquement de la superstition à l'athéisme, et d'une obéissance passive à une activité effrénée. La liberté fera sur tous ces tempéraments l'effet d'un vin ardent sur un homme qui n'y est point habitué. Le spectacle seul de cette liberté enivrera ceux qui n'y participent point encore. Que dans cette disposition générale des esprits il se présente quelque Pougatcheff d'Université (comme il peut s'en former aisément, puisque les manufactures sont ouvertes), qu'on ajoute l'indifférence, l'incapacité ou l'ambition de quelques nobles, la scélératesse étrangère, les manœuvres d'une secte détestable qui ne dort jamais etc., etc. . . . L'Etat suivant toutes les règles de la probabilité, *se romprait*, au pied de la lettre, comme une poutre trop longue qui ne porterait que par les extrémités.

JOSEPH DE MAISTRE.

A year shall come, our blackest year of all,
In which the crown of Russia's Tsars shall fall;
The mob shall change its old confiding mood,
And death and blood shall be our daily food.
Law overthrown, no more shall guard the lives
Of tender children and of guiltless wives;
Then stinking corpses shall send forth disease
To stalk throughout our wretched villages;
Men waving kerchiefs as they call you out,
Our country shall lie starving in the drought;
Red flames shall glow upon our streams that hour;
And then shall stand revealed the Man of Power;
And thou shalt know him and shalt understand
For what he holds the dagger in his hand.
And this is woe for thee! Thy tears, thy plaint
For him that day shall make but merriment;
And all in him is ghastly, all is gloom,
Even as his sable cloak and lofty plume.

M. LERMONTOV (1831).

RUSSIA is passing through the greatest crisis through which any country has ever passed. The magnitude and significance of this crisis is determined not only by the vast dimensions of the historical unit which we knew as Russia; the crisis is not only

political, economic and social, it is a crisis of the spirit of a people, of the elemental force of a nation in the conditions of an enormous world-revolution.

The consequences of this crisis can at present be sketched only by the imagination: for as far as abstract judgment can see, it may have the most various results, according to what forces prevail in its world development and how the balance of world history may go. But the nature of the crisis itself, its character, its moral content, can even now be fairly defined, and we are in a position to describe the historic soil on which the spiritual seeds of this crisis have fallen. In Russian historical and philosophic thought there is a tradition which places Russia in contrast with the rest of the civilised world,—the tradition of a special historic “call” of Russia, of her special “teaching mission.” This tradition has found various expressions, which in a certain sense are mutually contradictory. On the one hand men with minds of a profoundly religious temper have seen such a mission. For them the mission signified that Russia, and the Russian people, by its spiritual essence and creative genius would in some way recall and re-assert to the world the highest truth of Christianity. Such is the profound idea, at once historical, philosophical and religious, of the Slavophiles and of Dostoyevsky. This conception, this attitude, is not only religious in an abstract sense; it is definitely mystical. It is an experience akin to the eschatological aspirations of the early Christians.

Side by side with this there is an idea, formally identical with that just described, but set in a different context. This is the idea of a militant realisation of socialism, an atheistic faith, a belief not even in the Kingdom of God on earth, but in a godless supersession of all that is historic, of all that has happened irrationally and exists on the earth, especially including religion. Thus side by side with an apocalyptic Christian Messianism, there emerges a Messianism, if we may so say, of atheism, which has swollen and exacerbated the general anti-religious tradition, combining it with Maximalism in all other spheres—in economic, in social and in political thought.

In our troubled time a tendency is often observable to confuse these two very different conceptions of Russia’s “call.” It is possible that this confusion is psychologically inevitable and is due to a certain clouding of historical perspective, to a condition in which the mind is dazzled by the astonishing and

crying colours of the present. However, in fact, in fundamentals, there cannot here be either any confusion or even compromise. In the theory of a religious call to Russia, two ideas, two principles have been strained to their utmost limits. The first is the idea that a nation is a collective individuality, and that each human personality is an organic part of it and is sustained and fed by its willing obedience to it; the second is the idea of a blessing conferred, the idea of an individual and collective call from God. However modestly this call may be conceived, there will still always remain in it a certain religious content and a religious emotion. In the second theory the content and the psychology are anti-religious. Reduced to a modest expression, this content and this psychology may appear as a respectable sort of "Free-thought," of the type which in the historical development of thought attains its classic expression, for instance, in English philosophic Radicalism. Not merely Marx and Lenin, but not even Owen and Bentham can be brought into any association with Dostoyevsky and the Slavophiles. Here are two principles which, even if they repudiate their forms and expressions, cannot be blended.

There may be, of course, a purely formal psychological religion and religiosity, in which the passionate and fanatical denial of God may be considered as a special kind of religion and of religiosity. But great historical processes require not only psychological form and colour, but a spiritual content, which possesses an objective significance and an objective value for him who believes in this content.

Now the Russian Revolution is precisely the historical conflict of two such spiritual principles, and the struggle in it of political ideals and social aspirations is, in a certain cultural and philosophical sense, only a superficial expression and reflection of this profound conflict which is by no means ended; on the contrary, it has so far only passed through one phase and is now approaching another. The fundamental character of this conflict is only vaguely felt, whether by those who have taken or are taking part in it, or by outside observers. Hence the appearance in our time in Russia of hybrid ideologies which represent at one time the application of old conceptions to a new historical setting, at another attempts to reconcile in some way or other two warring principles, in whose conflict is to be found the spiritual content of the Russian Revolution.

In this connection it is highly characteristic that the life of ideas is at present developing almost exclusively in the so-called "emigration." It is a great error to regard the Russian "emigration," or rather the Russian refugees, as having any analogy with the "emigration" of the French Revolution or the "emigration" of the Imperial period of Russia. One of the peculiarities of the political and social revolution which has taken place in Russia is this :—that it has reduced spiritual life to a minimum, and, as all preceding history created in Russia an extremely intensive spiritual life, this life has at present in considerable measure moved across the frontier. We have, therefore, before us in the Russian refugees, not a political, nor even a social emigration but—as a result of the destruction of the elementary bases of economic and juridical life in the country—a geographical transposition of its conscious moral life. Thus the Russian emigration of to-day presents (in a volume of greater dimensions) an analogy with such phenomena as the transference of Greek learning into Italy after the fall of the Byzantine Empire, or the migration of those elements of culture which had to leave Catholic countries in consequence of religious persecution. And if these particular phenomena have perhaps had a greater importance for the world at large than the Russian anti-Bolshevik emigration, this last has a far greater importance for Russia itself than any previous exodus from any European country has ever had for it. The significance of the emigration at this time is almost exclusively spiritual, and, as such, it will find its expression in the Russia of the future, when the political struggle in its present forms has passed into the background, and social relations have become stabilised.

To the hybrid forms of ideology begotten by the Revolution belong the so-called Eurasianism and the so-called national Bolshevism.¹

Eurasianism in appearance continues the tradition of Slavophilism, but the idea that distinguished the latter movement

¹ Eurasianism has received its chief literary expression in a collective work, a series of articles entitled "The Exodus to the East : Presentiments and Achievements of the Eurasians" (Sofia, 1921)—articles of P. K. Savitsky, Suvchinsky, Prince N. S. Trubetskoy and Georgy Florovsky. National Bolshevism has found expression in the book of N. Ustryakhov, *Fighting for Russia*. Harbin, 1920, and in the series of articles : *A Change of Landmarks*, Prague, 1921 (articles of Y. V. Klyuchnikov, N. V. Ustryakhov, S. S. Lukyanov, A. Bobrishtsev-Pushkin, S. S. Chakhotin and Y. M. Potekhin). On both movements, see my articles in *Russkaya Mysl* last year and this.

and those German historical and philosophic theories which influenced it, was that a country or people having its own historical mission realised in it some universal idea, some truth common to humanity. Besides its formal distinctively national character, the idea of Slavophilism bore the impress of the widest universalism. In Eurasianism this feature is at least expressed, but much more weakly. Eurasianism envisages Russia as the chief element of a distinctive cultural whole, which it opposes to the German and Romance world which has created European and American civilisation. As far as the Eurasians have a doctrine, it consists in the assertion of the cultural and racial peculiarities of the peoples on the border between Europe and Asia. In this assertion is repeated the usual mistake of all such theories. Certain features are regarded not as the changing and flowing result of the historical environment and of events, but as *a priori* data which determine and fix in advance the conditions of this environment and these events. As far as Eurasianism emphasises and sets in the centre of any historical understanding of Russia's destinies the kinship of Russian culture with the Asiatic East, it reproduces in a strangely objective way the teaching of a Slav who hated Russia, a certain Pole named Duchinski, who more than fifty years ago preached that the Muscovites are an Eastern Turanian race, which has only a superficial contact with Western Slavonic culture, and which has assimilated the Scandinavian name of Russians and the Slavonic language.¹

Eurasianism and similar doctrines set the problem of elucidating those peculiarities of Russian culture which were created by the historic position of Russia between the West and the East, between Europe and Asia. Certainly there is here a problem, or rather a whole series of problems. The whole history of Russia is defined by its geographical position and the combination of certain historical events with this geographical position. It is absurd to oppose the Muscovites as nomad Turanians to the settled Aryan Europeans, as Duchinski does, but there is no doubt that in Russian history an enormous part

¹ I have in my hands this book: F. H. Duchinski (de Kiev): *"Peuples Aryâs et Tourans, Agriculteurs et Nomades. Nécessité des Réformes dans l'Exposition de l'Histoire des Peuples aryâs-européens et tourans, particulièrement des Slaves et des Moscovites."* (Paris, 1864.) To the criticism of the ideas of Duchinski, which in their day had an interest and meaning from the point of view of the struggle between Russia and Poland, are devoted, among others, several works of the famous Russian Slavist V. I. Lamansky.

has been played on one side by the invasions of nomads, and on the other by the spontaneous Russian colonisation of waste land in the East, which was directed against the nomads.

National Bolshevism is an attempt to idealise Bolshevism from the national point of view. Underlying this idealisation is the assumption that the national element of Bolshevism not only does not coincide with its international communist ideology, but even works in a directly opposite sense. This assumption relies on one correct theory and a whole series of incorrect ones. The correct premiss is this: that the internationalist communist ideology is alien to the Russian people, that it has only made use of the rousing of the masses and some of their instincts, and, after creating a military organisation, uses it to rule the people. Quite incorrect and utopian is the idea that this organisation can carry out any kind of national mission. The facts do not present anything to support the national idealisation of Bolshevism. The characteristic feature of the Russian Revolution—as it has actually been carried out in Bolshevism—is not only and not so much the weakening of the State and of its power in its traditional form; far more important than the fall of the State is the weakening both of the physical strength of the population, and of its spiritual culture under the Bolshevik *régime*. In present day Russia the population is dying out. This process began with the towns, where it was seen to be a concomitant of the decay of town life and civilisation. It has now passed over into the country. No reunion of Russia under the power of the Soviets can mask this fundamental fact of biology and of cultural and economic life; in consequence of the destruction of certain forms and instincts of economic life in that historic area, which is occupied by the Russian people—a destruction dictated first by the communist ideology and, secondly, by the desire for power of certain individuals and of definite groups among these individuals—the capacity of the territory to maintain population has been reduced. Here we can observe as clear as day over an enormous area the phenomenon of economic decline—a phenomenon which for other historical *milieus* and epochs we can only fix hypothetically.

As a matter of fact, for other *milieus* and epochs we are either not in a position to fix exactly and independently the details of general decline; such, in my view, is the complicated case of that process which we usually call the decline and fall of the Roman Empire; or else we are not able to point out the

concrete conditions, that mechanism of cause and effect, which has led to the given result; such, it seems to me, is the case of the devastation of Nearer Asia. In Russian history itself, we have a special example in the devastation of the Kiev State during the incursions of the pre-Tartar nomads and the Tartar invasion. But this process was very considerably balanced by an event which took place at the same time, the colonisation of the more northern and eastern areas of later Russia, a colonisation which issued both from the Kiev district and from Novgorod. In 1918, one of the best-known Russian historians, after the Bolsheviks were already in power, gave a lecture in a private house in Moscow, in which he identified the establishment of the Bolshevik *régime* in its social and cultural significance with the Tartar devastation and rule in Russia. Unfortunately we are objectively compelled to recognise that this respected historian pronounced a too optimistic view. For there is no doubt that the Tartar invasion was a far more superficial phenomenon than the communist rule. To express oneself in terms of French sociology (Lacombe-Durkheim), the Tartar invasion and rule was much more an "event" than an "institution." Bolshevism as an "event" destroyed much, and as an "institution" or a *régime* undermined much more. Moreover—and this is the chief point—it undermined and shook the economic foundation of the people's life and culture. One need not be an economic materialist to acknowledge the fundamental significance of economic facts for human communities. Cultural phenomena and forces such as religion or learning are, of course, not determined as to their content by economic processes, but the cultural life of a people is undoubtedly dependent on the economic level; and the lowering of this level below a certain point cannot but menace cultural life. Thus the communists who adhere to Marx have by their own work demonstrated that the economic interpretation of history is only partially true.

But, on the other hand, both the initial success of the Bolsheviks and the continued existence of their power in conditions of unheard-of economic devastation, are a complete departure from the usual scheme of the economic interpretation of history. The communist power existing in Russia is completely devoid of any positive economic foundation. It is an essentially political fact which, if it rests economically on anything, rests on a purely negative basis, on the impoverishment and penury of the people, created by the Government itself. The so-called "new economic

policy," or, to put it differently, the evolution of Bolshevism, is most curious and significant precisely from this sociological point of view. Its aim is to create in the country a new economic basis, or, rather, to establish the old economic bases which existed before the advent of Bolshevism to power. This means, to use Marxist terminology, that the economic foundation of the community must be changed, but all the while the communists desire to preserve their political power; that is, the Marxist communists desire by a historical experiment to refute in their own favour the historic philosophy of Marx. Actually, of course, they will not succeed in this, for it is not in a metaphysical and absolute sense, but in an empiric and relative sense, that the economic interpretation of history can justly fix the inter-relation of social processes. The Russian Revolution has proved to be an impressive confirmation of the truth that political revolutions are always the final stage of some accumulation of popular forces seeking outlet.

Again, one does not need to be an economic materialist in the Marxian sense to see clearly that the revolutionary movement and agitation which have laid hold on Russia since the beginning of the XXth century are most intimately connected with her economic development, with the development of agriculture and industry, with the accumulation of wealth and capital, with the growth of population and with the enormous growth in the volume of intellectual culture. And the historical problem lies not at all in the origin of the Revolution: for it, like the French Revolution, is the outcome, not so much of the negative and destructive forces and aspects of the old *régime*, as of the positive forces and cultural tendencies which have developed within it. The real historical problem lies in the destructive and anti-cultural content of this Revolution, which has led to an unexampled economic collapse, and actually threatens the population with extinction. How was it possible for its destructive tendencies to assume such dimensions?

With the usual optimistic faith in progress this course of affairs is in complete dissonance. But we must in the end, like the greatest philosophical minds of the last century, have the courage to acknowledge that progress is not at all obligatory for humanity, that evil is, in the life of the kosmos and of mankind, just as much a real and independent principle as good; that over man, in humanity and its story, there wrestle God and the Devil. This is before all empirically irrefutable.

The peculiarity of the Russian Revolution consists in this:

that its agent is not simply the "people," but the armed people. The war created the active force of the Revolution. It was only through the war that such enormous masses of people could actively engage in the Revolution. This circumstance defined the force and scope of the Revolution. To comprehend this side of the question, we must keep in mind that what we understand as the force and scope of such movements as revolutions depends, in the last resort, not only on the force of the attack, but on the relation of the attack to the resistance. Thus the historic problem of the political and social revolution which has taken place in Russia involves the elucidation of the following questions:—(1) How did it come about that there took place in Russia a revolution against property? (2) Why and how could this Revolution succeed and to what has its work led?

The questions which I have asked are purely problems of historical sociology. The key to the solution of the first question we shall find if we turn our attention to the relation between the forces of attack and of resistance in the Russian Revolution. The attack was led in the name of the idea of socialism and communism against existing property, and the idea of property altogether. Here the decisive factor was, that in virtue of the late development of Russian ideologies under the influence of the West, in the Russian educated class, which socially was a peculiar variant of the bourgeoisie, the prevailing point of view was socialistic, while in the masses of the people there had not been developed either the habits or the idea of property. On this last factor we must dwell with attention. Russian agrarian evolution does not begin with primitive communism; but it developed, in the course of the centuries which preceded the emancipation of the peasants, an agrarian system in which, instead of the idea of peasant property, there prevailed the idea of the peasant lot (*nadel*).¹

While in the West of Europe it was the system of feudalism and serfdom which itself gave birth to peasant property and shaped it, in Russia this was just what did not happen, and

¹ In Russia, the classic land of "communal land tenure," we cannot, in the earliest epochs of its history, find traces of this institution, whose real history was discovered precisely by Russian economists (especially by my very dear friend, the late Professor A. A. Kaufmann) and historians (especially by A. Y. Efimenko, also deceased, the most remarkable historian among Russian women). The results of the work of Russian scholars have been extremely well summarised in the *English* book of the *Polish* scholar J. S. Lewinski: *The Origin of Property and the Formation of the Village Community* (London, 1913).

although at the moment of the Russian Revolution there was not in a single large European State so large a number absolutely or relatively of economically independent cultivators, living on their own land—peasant property in Russia did not exist. It did not exist in this sense, that the institution of property had not yet made itself the habitual and firm regulating principle of the life of the masses of the people. The combination of Socialism among the educated classes and of the absence of a feeling for property in the masses of the peasantry, created that mental atmosphere in which the Russian Revolution took its course. The institution of property was defenceless on two sides: the *intelligentsia* had intellectually renounced it, and the masses of the people had not yet arrived at it. This is the historical explanation of that lack of any conscious resistance to the Russian Revolution's onslaught upon property. As far as there existed elements of settled peasant property in pre-Revolution Russia—to create which had been the aim of men like Stolypin and Krivoshein—these elements were also swept away by the Revolution. The Revolution swept down equally the property of gentry and of peasantry. That is why, from a purely objective point of view, those are wrong who say that the Revolution destroyed in Russia some kind of feudal system. In the history of Russia there were, of course, also elements of a feudal system; but in 1917, what was swept away was not those elements but the whole principle of private property. The character of the agrarian revolution in Russia was determined precisely by the fact that in Russia, properly speaking, there was lacking that period of development and that structure of life which is called in the West feudal, and in which (speaking historically) the idea and institution of peasant property had grown up. In Russia it was only in the XIXth century that the State, at first tentatively in the legislation of the period of Emancipation, and afterwards in an audacious and revolutionary manner in Stolypin's legislation, created peasant property; while in the West, in such countries as Germany and France, within a real feudal system, peasant property had evolved itself, and through the emancipation of the peasants in the West, peasant property was emancipated from the dues imposed upon it. In Russia, on the other hand, the emancipation of the peasants, apart from their personal liberation from serfdom, consisted of two elements: (1) their endowment with land by the legislation of Alexander II. on an extremely indefinite and questionable title of possession, and (2) their endowment with something more or less like a real

right of property by the legislation of Stolypin. The Revolution, abolishing the gentry's property "of common right," produced an anarchical supplementary endowment of the peasants with land, in the name of Socialism and accompanied by a declaration of the socialisation of land. Neither those conditions of the Russian agrarian system which preceded the Revolution, nor its own content authorise us to identify it with the fall of a system of feudalism and bondage. The agrarian system which existed in Russia up to the Revolution has nothing in common with feudalism. It may be called to a certain extent a serf-system within the peasantry itself. And if the agrarian revolution was the last struggle of the old Russia of serfdom and peasant communes, this struggle did not demolish feudalism, which as a matter of fact never existed; what is demolished was such elements and germs of common property as had evolved historically in Russia.

When people compare the Russian Revolution with the French, they forget that, apart from some rather superficial similarities of a purely political kind, the old *régime* of France presents no analogy to the old *régime* which was destroyed by the Russian Revolution. For the old *régime* of France the characteristic features of fundamental significance were as follows: (1) the particularism, or diversified character of law and of administration in a unitary national and cultural environment; (2) the restrictions on trade; (3) the restrictions on industry (both these sets of restrictions being the outcome at once of custom and of political legislation); (4) the extreme development of class privileges and, in particular, the application of social categories in taxation. In the Russia of the old *régime* there did not exist either that particularism or that archaic character of law and order which was so characteristic of France. We may remember that Voltaire said in jest that if one travelled through France, each time one changed horses one had to change one's law, and one of the most recent investigators of the pre-Revolution *régime* asserts that not even the most precise cartographic skill could convey the differentiation of law in the France of the old *régime*.

From halfway through the eighteenth century we can date in Russia the final triumph of the freedom of internal trade, and internal customs were abolished in Russia by the autocratic Empress Elizabeth about forty years before they were abolished by the French Parliament of the Revolution. In Russia at the time of the French Revolution, while serfdom still remained,

there already prevailed in practice and to a considerable extent in law, the principle of freedom of industry. This was noted with astonishment by the best observer of Russian economic life of that period, the celebrated economist Storch, a Russian subject German born, and Anglo-French in his sociological ideas, being the pupil of Adam Smith, Bentham and Say. From halfway through the XIXth century, criminal and civil procedure in Russia was fundamentally the procedure of Revolutionary and Imperial France. In Russia social categories still existed. But after all, even in the very first period following the fall of genuine slavery such as Russian serfdom, class privileges had in Russia, as compared with France, only a trifling significance; of class inequality in taxation at the moment of the Revolution it would even be ridiculous to speak. In a word, the economic and the legal and administrative content of the French Revolution had for the most part been realised in Russia by the so-called "old régime." This is clear to any one who knows history and thinks of historical matters as they are with a clear mind, and does not simply repeat sounding words and demagogic phrases.

There is one other peculiarity in Russian national development, as compared with the development of the great peoples of Western Europe. With the exception perhaps of Spain, in Western Europe there had sunk deep into the national spirit that movement which is known under the general name of the Reformation. Even in countries where this movement did not externally appear at all strongly, as in Italy, and where it was crushed by the reaction of the Church and State, as in France and in the provinces of Austria, it still shook the national consciousness and left on it a deep trace. The significance of the Reformation and of the Catholic reaction which is so closely connected with it consists in this—that with the help of religion and the Church, principles of a certain social morality and discipline deeply penetrated the soul of the people. The Reformation marks the secularisation of Christian morality, its conversion into a discipline and practice of everyday life—or, if you like to call it so, its "*embourgeoisement*."

I do not mean to say that the significance of the Reformation, or generally of the religious movements of modern times, is exhausted by this. They have an aspect deeply religious and mystical, and this mystic element of the Reformation sometimes blends deeply and organically with the political and educational aspect, that of practical citizenship; if I am not mistaken, Lord Rosebery has aptly described Cromwell as a practical mystic.

In Russia there was no Reformation and there was no secularisation of Christian morality, nor was it ever converted into a method and discipline of everyday life, into a bourgeois morality. In Russia there was religion and a religious sense, but into everyday life as a principle of discipline religion did not penetrate. One of the most remarkable thinkers of the end of the XVIIIth century and the beginning of the XIXth, Joseph de Maistre, who lived for many years in Russia, caught most exactly this feature of Russian development, although the character of the Russian religious sense remained for him unintelligible :—

“ Cette puissance conservatrice et préservatrice (la religion), ” he wrote, “ n'existe pas en Russie. La religion y peut quelque chose sur l'esprit humain, mais rien du tout sur le cœur où naissent cependant tous les désirs et tous les crimes. ” ¹

Starting from the idea that “ jamais un grand peuple ne peut être gouverné par le gouvernement. J'entends par le gouvernement seul, ” ² and marking the penetration into the Russian educated class of advanced Western European ideas, Joseph de Maistre from the absence of religious education in the Russian people deduced the possibility in Russia of the most destructive revolution, in which “ quelque Pougatcheff d'université ” literally “ smashes up ” the State. The famous words “ slaves in rebellion ” ³ were literally anticipated in this prophecy of Joseph de Maistre. But what is interesting and material in the prophecy of the French thinker is not this sketch of his of the coming revolution, which is psychologically not very profound, but its deep historical, philosophical, and at the same time religious interpretation. Alike in the spiritual and in the social and political evolution of the Russian people there is a missing link, which for the evolution of the peoples of the West is no less material, indeed, perhaps even more material, than the system of feudalism and bondage and municipal institutions. The bourgeois moral and bourgeois discipline had not in Russia those roots out of which they grow in West European civilisation, and from which also sprang Socialism itself as a movement of civilisation. ⁴

¹ *Quatre Chapitres inédits sur la Russie* (Paris, 1859), p. 19. De Maistre, as is known, saw an affinity between the Orthodox and the Protestant religious sense.

² *op. cit.*, p. 23.

³ These words, as is known, belong to Mr. Kerensky.

⁴ The fundamental idea here expressed will be found in one of my Cambridge Lectures, printed in the collection *Russian Realities and Problems* (1917).

A contemporary observer of the French Revolution remarked that revolutions are of two kinds: some pursue some definite national, political or social object; others represent, so to speak, a general movement of the spirit or soul of the nation, a movement inspired by exhaustion, discontent and unrest. And it was in the second category that this observer placed the great French Revolution.¹

Here we return to the starting point of our reflections. The crisis through which Russia has passed is not only a political, economic and social crisis; it is a crisis of the national spirit. A whole period of Russian spiritual life has reached its conclusion. The real significance of this period is that during it the Russian *intelligentsia* lived through the West European ideas and moods of the XVIIIth and XIXth centuries. These ideas sank down into the people, and produced that political and social explosion through which we have passed. Between the ideas and the social *milieu* into which they penetrated there was from the beginning a full correspondence, and yet simultaneously a complete lack of correspondence. To the people were accessible only those Maximalist Socialist ideas which were most popular in the *intelligentsia*; moderate liberal ideas, or even the ideas of moderate, gradual Reformist Socialism were for the people uninteresting and unproductive. But, on the other hand, the Maximalist ideas have not succeeded in being anything but destructive. The essence of Maximalism is in the fact that its ideas defy the limitations imposed by human life, and therefore their effect upon it is to destroy, and to break up organic ties. So it was in this Revolution. As an economic and social transformation, it has suffered complete failure. But this failure is only an external expression of a crisis prepared for decades past—an internal crisis of the ideas which have inspired the whole movement; and now we come to the greatest difference of all between the Russian and French Revolutions. In France the literature of the XVIIIth century created a spirit which held an undivided supremacy and had no rivals. Besides it, there was no intellectual current, capable at the time of producing great minds or of making or marring great works. “L’esprit classique,” as formulated by the XVIIIth century, inspired the Revolution and embodied itself in it. Only later came Joseph de Maistre and Auguste Comte.

¹ Baron de Barante: *De la Littérature française pendant le dix-huitième Siècle*. See pages 244-7 of the first edition. This remarkable sketch of the spirit of the Revolution by a man who lived through it appeared anonymously in 1809.

It was quite different in Russia. Its spiritual life, that spirit which inspired the Revolution and embodied itself in it, was neither specially original nor undisputed, nor was it the most powerful of spiritual forces. Even if by stretching a point it is possible to assign Leo Tolstoy to the Revolution (though his anti-political and at the same time religious outlook makes this extremely difficult), it is clearly impossible to do anything of the kind with regard to other great figures of Russian spiritual culture, such as Pushkin, Gogol, the Slavophiles, Dostoyevsky, Leontyev, Vladimir Solovyev, Rozanov. The spirit of Russian culture, as expressed in the work of these men, and as linked up through them with the spiritual work of earlier and crude periods of literature, which found expression chiefly in church life, is not the spirit of the Russian Revolution. This is a purely objective sociological statement. The genealogy of the spirit of the Russian Revolution can also be fairly accurately traced, and it will then appear that the spirit of the Russian Revolution was brought from the West, that it is the fruit of the adoption by the Russian *intelligentsia* of the advanced ideas of Western peoples. In accordance with the period of history that gave it birth, and in distinction from the spirit of the French Revolution, the spirit of the Russian Revolution is found to be completely dominated by the Socialist idea. In this spirit, however, there are no original native elements at all. This is why it took possession of the mass of the Russian people in a process of temporary mental agitation, and is maintaining itself to-day quite definitely by external compulsion. In Russia, altogether beyond the external political and social Revolution there lies concealed an altogether different spiritual problem and conflict, and one of much greater importance. This problem was set by the whole development of the Russian spirit in the XIXth century: and the triumph of an external revolution, the most radical in the history of the world, has only set free minds and spirits for the working out of this tremendous problem. The external break has exhausted itself and is finished. We are at the beginning of the "internal break"—the coming home of the Russian spirit.

It is thus that the inner tragedy of the Russian Revolution is slowly unfolding itself—a tragedy far more real than all the political and social contradictions of the struggle. That is why such phrases as "the overthrow of Tsarism" or "the triumph of Socialism" are quite inadequate to describe such gigantic events as those of which Russia has been the scene. What has taken

place is not merely the destruction of one system and the triumph of another, as a result of the outward conflict of two hostile forces and two orders of things ; what is gradually disclosing itself before our eyes is an inward struggle of two spiritual orders for which by no means the most important thing is their relation to this or that political or social system.

It is only from this angle that we can understand events in Russia, as at one and the same time the tragedy of a nation and the tragedy of human history. Only thus can we detect in it not only disruption, catastrophe and ruin, but logical sequence purification and revival.

PETER STRUVE.

A SURVEY OF SLAVISTIC STUDIES.

I.

THE cradle of Slavistic studies as a special branch of philological-historical research is to be sought in Prague at the close of the XVIIIth and the beginning of the XIXth century. Father Joseph Dobrovský (1753-1829) is generally recognised as its spiritual father. In two modest little books (*Slavin*, published in 1806-8, and *Slovanka*, 1814-15) he proclaimed to the Slavonic reading public the urgent necessity for establishing the serious scientific study of the languages, literatures, and antiquities of all branches of the Slav race. What had till then been mere *membra disjecta* must be converted into a closely knit organic whole. He showed the true explorer's instinct in selecting, as the basis for this work of constructing a new science, the Church Slavonic language, and he laid down as the first and most important problem an enquiry into the grammatical and lexicographical aspect of that language, as the key to all modern Slav idioms. At the same time he recommended the study of various interconnected questions, such as the history of Saints Cyril and Methodius and the various Slav translations of the Bible, the origin of the twofold Slavonic script, etc. Dobrovský was a clear and critical mind, free from the mists of romantic sentiment, and all his verdicts are marked by a freedom from prejudice and a tendency to concentrate upon points of primary importance. His principal work, *Institutiones Linguae Slavicæ Veteris Dialecti* (1821), which was only completed towards the close of his life, may be compared in its far-reaching importance with such later works as the Comparative Grammar of Bopp and the German Grammar of Jakob Grimm: but one misses in it that firm adherence to historical traditions which has been so justly admired in the work of his Russian contemporary Alexander Vostokov.

Dobrovský's appeal awakened sympathetic response in many quarters, but no one showed greater enthusiasm and understanding than the learned Carniolan Slovene, Bartholomew Kopitar (1780-1844), an official in the Hofbibliothek of Vienna. These two men, so different in nature but inspired by the same

aims, soon exercised a strong attraction on each other, as is shown by their highly instructive correspondence: the one proved to be the complement of the other, by many a suggestion and even disagreement. Kopitar was full of good ideas, but, in contrast to the philosophic calm of Dobrovský, he sometimes allowed himself to be carried away by side issues, to which he then clung with extreme obstinacy—above all his Pan-Slovene Pannonian theory, his preference for Vienna and Austria, his dislike of the Russians, his leanings towards linguistic particularism.

Neither scholar had any academic position from which they could have put forward *ex cathedra* the principles and aims of the new science. None the less the seed fell upon fruitful ground. The spirit of the age, the flourishing romantic movement with its influence upon national regeneration, had created an atmosphere highly favourable to such studies. The little group of disciples, inspired by a newly kindled enthusiasm for every thing Slav, but at first confined mainly to Bohemia, grew fairly rapidly into a numerous band of men in every Slavonic country, and, though fighting under different standards, all made the revival of Slavdom their common goal. Study of the past as a means to comprehension of the present, such was their watchword. In seeking to penetrate thus deeply into the life of the Slav peoples, the new movement had gone far beyond Slav philology and set itself to further "Slavistics" in the widest sense of the term (*slavyanovedenie*). Among the earliest pupils from the school of Dobrovský was V. Hanka (1791-1861), who, in his studies of early Czech literature, was influenced rather by patriotic than scientific considerations and noticed with pain the absence of such poems as the Russian Song of Igor (*Slovo o polku Igoreve*) or the Serbian popular ballads to which the attention of Europe had recently been drawn. What does not exist can perhaps be artificially created: it is a mere experiment—so Hanka may have thought to himself. And, in point of fact, after a certain time fragments of old Czech poetry began to appear, which eventually were proved to be forgeries. None the less they kept the whole of Czech public opinion in positive ecstasy for several decades, and thus led Slavonic philology in Bohemia into false paths. Meanwhile the school of Kopitar in Vienna presented the Serbian race with Vuk Karadžić (1787-1864), the famous collector of folksongs and at the same time the founder of the modern Serbian literary language. His reforms coincided with the Illyrian movement in Croatia and

led gradually, after various struggles and blunders, to the achievement of linguistic unity between the Serbs and Croats, though not as yet to complete unity in literary matters. It is true that Vuk's master, Kopitar, had not anticipated this result and indeed, being in favour of the predominance of dialects according to ancient Greek models, he was strongly opposed to the displacement of the Croat "Kaj"-dialect by the Illyrian "Što." His sympathies for Kristianović, the last champion of the "Kaj," could not avail to save this from its fate : but among the Slovenes separatist tendencies predominated, being doubtless materially assisted by the advent of the poet Prešern.

Dobrovský was entirely free from romanticist tendencies, while even Kopitar only tolerated them to a very moderate degree; but in Bohemia they soon won the upper hand, and Dobrovský's critical methods lost ground. The new Slavonic school produced such efforts as the early works of Paul Joseph Šafařík (1795-1861)—*History of the Slav Literatures* (1826) and *Concerning the Origin of the Slavs* (1828); and indeed, in some respects, even his *Slavonic Antiquities* (1837) must be assigned to this group. National romanticism was expounded in a much higher degree by the poet and antiquary Jan Kollár (1793-1852) in a succession of works—the epic poem *Slavy Dcera* (the daughter of Slava), *Travels* (Cestopis, 1841-3), the half cultural, half political essay on *Slavonic Reciprocity* (1837), and, finally, the bulky and fantastic work entitled *Das slavische Ur-Italien* (1853). From this period right up to the present day it is by no means uncommon to find works resting on quite false scientific foundations and owing their origin to the romantic and uncritical conception of Slavonic origins. It will suffice to give the names of Šembera, Boguslavski and Žunković.

II.

This intellectual movement among the south-western Slavs did not remain confined to the Habsburg dominions—Bohemia, Slovakia, the Croats, Serbs and Slovenes—but spread to the east of Europe. In Russia and Poland the language and history of these countries and their inhabitants were, of course, eagerly, though not very scientifically, studied at the universities. Even before the rise of Dobrovský's school, there are, according to present day standards, many names which deserve to be quoted as forerunners of Slavistic study—for instance, among the Poles, Ossolinski, Linde, Bandtke, Rakowiecki, Lelewel, Surowiecki; among the Russians, Karamzin, Evgeny Timkovsky, Shishkov,

Stroyev and others. None of these men stood closer to Dobrovský and Kopitar than Alexander Vostokov (1781-1864), the most sober of Slav philologists, as Miklosich has characterised him. His objective attitude and faithful reproduction of traditional facts, backed by such admirable sources for the comprehension of Old Slavonic in its oldest form as the *Ostromir Gospel* (1056-7) or the *Izbornik* of Svyatoslav (1073), placed him in the enviable position of passing a more accurate verdict than Dobrovský on various peculiarities of Church Slavonic, in an essay entitled *Consideration* (Razsuzhdenie), published in the year 1820—in other words, before the appearance of the *Institutiones*. Among other points he deserves high credit for his detection of nasalism in the most ancient Church Slavonic records. That so well qualified an enquirer should have failed to obtain a chair at any Russian university, is due to the simple fact that he stammered so badly as to be entirely unable to lecture: he thus found himself restricted to work in libraries and afterwards in the Academy of Sciences. Among his most praiseworthy achievements are the model description of Slavonic manuscripts in the Rumyantsev collection (1842) and the splendid edition of the *Ostromir Gospel* (1843). Another contemporary of the Dobrovský school whose name deserves a place beside that of Vostokov is K. Kalaydovich, whose painstaking research in Russian libraries led to various handsome publications under the auspices of the Russian Mæcenæ, Count Rumyantsev. His voluminous work on Ioann Exarch of Bulgaria (1828), a hitherto quite unknown Bulgarian writer of the tenth century, created such a sensation that even a Dobrovský hardly knew what to make of it.

Since Kalaydovitch also appeared unsuited for the Slavonic Chair, the Russians, influenced by the growing Slav movement beyond the Austrian frontier, hit upon the idea of meeting the needs of this new science and the lively interest which it was arousing, by summoning properly qualified teachers from abroad and in particular from Bohemia. Thanks to Hanka's many connections with influential Russians, on whom he heaped attentions during their visits to Prague, the first idea was to invite this much overrated man, the names of Šafařík and eventually Čelakovsky only receiving secondary consideration. This blunder, though not recognised as such at the time, contributed in no small degree to the failure of the whole affair. The Russian side of the negotiations was in the hands of the then Minister, Admiral Shishkov, who regarded himself as a great

scholar, and of P. Köppen, as intermediary. The ground was not sufficiently prepared for the filling of a university chair, still less for the erection of the projected central Slavonic library at the Academy of Sciences. Moreover, the negotiations could not have been more clumsily conducted. Strangely enough, similar plans were under consideration in Poland, but there from the outset the exactly opposite method was adopted, namely that of sending young men abroad to study under the recognised Slav authorities. The first of these was Bobrowski in Vilna, who even before the year 1820 came to consult Kopitar in Vienna and Dobrovský in Prague. As to the result of these visits we can only form conjectures from his subsequent travels among the Southern Slavs and in Italy. For instance, we know that he was in Dalmatia, and that while in Rome he wrote a short description of the Slavonic manuscripts in the Vatican library. He was, however, of little profit to Slavistic studies since, after hesitating for some time between Slavonic and theological studies, he obtained a Chair in the latter subject on his return to Vilna. There was a similar result in the case of Andrew Kucharski, who was sent abroad from Warsaw in 1825 with the same object. He too travelled, even as far as Montenegro, and brought home with him a few valuable manuscripts and books, but he obviously lacked the talent to turn his experiences and studies to the advantage of Slavonic science. Moreover, the Polish Revolution, which broke out soon after his return from Moscow to Warsaw, deprived him of the chance of a Chair of Slavonic, and he had to rest satisfied with a post at a gymnasium.

III.

The example thus set by the Poles, even though it had not proved successful, eventually hastened the Russian decision to send young candidates abroad for the purpose of studying Slavonic languages and intellectual movements; and this decision was still further influenced by the friendly relations between Pogodin and Šafařík. Indeed, for some time Šafařík himself thought that fate would bring him to Russia. A first experiment, due mainly to Pogodin, to send the Ugro-Russian Venelin to Bulgaria, led to no concrete result for Russian Slavistic studies: for though the Bulgarians to this day revere his memory, his studies of their origin and history were entirely uncritical. The next stage was to impose upon individual universities the duty of finding suitable candidates to be sent

to the Western or Southern Slavs. In Moscow, the choice fell upon O. M. Bodyansky ; for Kharkov, upon I. I. Sreznevsky ; for St. Petersburg, on P. Preis ; and, a little later, for Kazan, on V. Grigorovich. Within the limits of the present brief survey it would be impossible to follow these men in their often very romantic travels, the details of which only became known long afterwards from their correspondence. They were to study "Land und Leute," language, literature and customs, in order to return, enriched with all kinds of knowledge, and lecture upon the Slav peoples at the universities to which they had already been assigned. The programmes laid down for them were on the one hand calculated to hamper their work, and on the other very incomplete. Those who sent them had, indeed, not overlooked the fact that among the Slavs with whose countries they were to become acquainted there was practically no ready material for the Russian visitors, and that the national movement was in a state of lively effervescence—in Bohemia, a struggle for the recognition of the Czech language ; in Slovakia, a dispute as to the establishment of one Slovak dialect as a new literary language ; in Croatia, the excitement of the Illyrian movement ; in Serbia, the conflict between Vuk and conservative tendencies. Hence the main task assigned to the candidates was that of visiting the various territories in question, which, in fact, stamped them as "scientific tourists." They carried out this task in a most conscientious manner. To take two examples : Sreznevsky's travels in Istria and Dalmatia were for that period a very remarkable achievement, while Grigorovich's wanderings in European Turkey were subject to still greater difficulties. They thus had ample opportunities of collecting the raw material, but no attempt was made to help on its scientific digestion, whether by university lectures or publication in essay form, or to send them to such universities as could have taught them systematic methods in this respect. (The solitary Petersburg candidate, Peter Preis, who had already studied philology at Dorpat and showed a stronger natural bent for philology than any of the others, was eager to study under Bopp in Berlin and to study Lithuanian at Königsberg.) We need not, therefore, be surprised that none of them provided a key to the grammatical study of one or other Slavonic language, nor even a survey of one or other Slavonic literature. They brought home with them a wealth of personal impressions and no doubt certain individual friendships, but that was all. The only exception was Grigorovich, who still arouses our wonder by the crafty

tactics which enabled him to bring safely back to Russia from Mount Athos and other Balkan monasteries rich treasure of Slavonic manuscripts,—whole or in fragments. As fate would have it, he himself hardly made any use of this material. He only wrote one very valuable survey (*Ocherk*) of his Turkish travels (Kazan, 1848), which, with a few essays published in 1851 and 1859, showed how much more we might have been entitled to expect from him. But after his transference from Kazan to Odessa he frittered away his immense knowledge of Christian-Byzantine literature upon all kinds of trifles.

Incomparably more fruitful was the scientific activity of I. I. Sreznevsky, though, after his summons to replace Preis at the University of St. Petersburg, he was rather a representative of old Russian literary history than of Slavistics in the narrower sense. His aim was to extend our knowledge of Church Slavonic and old Russian records, of which he published a great many, though unfortunately for the most part in a somewhat fragmentary way; his attention was directed less to their linguistic than to their bibliographical, critical and paleographical aspect. On the Slavistic side he also performed for some years the very useful task of reporting upon recent literary publications in the Slavistic field, especially in non-Russian Slav countries—in the Reports (*Izvestia*) of the Russian section of the Academy. Though these reports ceased to appear after the tenth volume, his work for them remained in such good repute for years afterwards in Academy circles that their publication was revived in 1896 (it is true, in a somewhat altered form). To me it seems that these modern reports (which are known to me up to the year 1914) do not altogether possess that close touch with Slavonic literatures outside Russia which so admirably characterised Sreznevsky. Certainly in this respect the Russian reports have been outdistanced by the *Rocznik Slawistyczny* of Cracow.

√ The Moscow representative of Slavistics O. M. Bodyansky, who during his stay in Prague had received the special attention of Šafařík, did not come up to the expectations of his teacher, who, as a keen and extremely discreet observer of men, had at quite an early date revealed his dissatisfaction, particularly in letters to Pogodin. In point of fact, Bodyansky turned out to be a very dull and unpractical scholar, whose scientific achievements were quite in keeping with his character. He printed texts of old documents with mechanical accuracy, but also in quite undigested form, and sometimes in unnecessary detail; a terrifying example of this is his reprint of the Legends

of Cyril and Methodius. His independent researches into the two Slavonic alphabets (1855), despite their prolixity, did not bring the problem any nearer solution. On the other hand, he did useful work by his Russian translations of the essays of Šafařík, and by his edition of the grammar of Križanić.

One is driven to the conclusion that none of the first Russian Slavists, however meritorious, had a clear conception of their real task, which was to graft Slavonic studies upon the intellectual life of Russia, and that none of them attained success in this direction. These early pioneers, without being personally much to blame, were victims of the confused outlook which then prevailed in official circles towards the whole problem. Russian Slavistic studies were in reality a cross between philology, literary history, archæology and ethnography. They lacked the proper focus which scientific research into the various Slavonic languages would have supplied, and till a much later period they were without any definite organisation. This was partly due to the fact that this science was not yet quite free and independent in its movements, but was unduly subordinated, on the one hand, to the Byzantine Orthodox point of view, and, on the other hand, to the political philosophy put forward by the Russian Slavophiles. These two factors gave rise to preconceived ideas where Slav cultural tendencies were concerned, and the Byzantine East was accorded a quite undue preference over the Roman, or, to be more accurate, *European*, West. Though it is doubtless true that the great wealth of Slavonic monuments in the East still provides Slavonic philology with its most attractive subject of enquiry, it remains equally true that the primitive period of the whole cultural development of the Western (or, as we may call it, the Catholic) half of Slavdom deserves much more attention even from Russian Slavists. One of the ancient West Slavonic linguistic sources—the highly remarkable Freising fragments—has, it is true, been scientifically treated in Russia, but this work was done not by any official Slavist, but by Vostokov, with Köppen as intermediary. For the rest the *Glagolita Clozianus* was published by Kopitar, while the Prolegomena which he attached to his edition of the Rheims Gospel were actually suppressed by the Russian censorship. Again, an early Polish monument, the Psalter of St. Florian, was published at the expense of a Polish Mæcenas, with the very material assistance of Kopitar, and the same thing happened at a later date to the *Codex Assemanianus*, the *Codex Zographensis*, etc. Even the much discussed question

as to the authenticity of the Königinhof and Grünberg Manuscripts remained *a noli me tangere* for Russian Slavists, no doubt mainly in order not to hurt the reputation of Hanka, who had been so popular in Russia. It was only at a very late date that a representative of the second generation of Slavonic studies, V. I. Lamansky, added his weight to the campaign which at home in Bohemia had already been decided against the genuine character of the manuscripts: and, indeed, it is hardly possible to agree with the line of argument adopted by him.

IV

Before, however, we deal with the second and third generation of Russian Slavists, we must allude to the great transformation wrought in Slavonic studies in Austria, and particularly in Vienna, as a result of the revolution of 1848. For Vienna, the choice fell upon Francis Miklosich, a friend and admirer of Kopitar, who did not live to see the fulfilment of this long-cherished wish. Miklosich (1813-1891), a Slovene from Styria, as his master had been a Slovene from Carniola, had already, before the upheaval, proved himself to be a proper candidate for the post by various philological publications. In 1844 he wrote a very learned review of Bopp's Grammar; in 1847, a detailed survey of Vostokov's edition of the Ostromir Gospel; in 1845 he published his *Radices* as a separate work, and, finally, two fragments from the Codex Suprasliensis, whose publication Kopitar had planned for many years, and added a commentary and grammatical notes. Moreover, this happy selection was fully justified. It is true that as a reward for certain political services, Jan Kollár, the famous poet of the sonnet cycle, *Slavy Dcera*, was appointed Professor of Slavonic archæology at the same university, but this Chair did not last long and indeed need hardly be taken into account. Meanwhile, Miklosich owed the great and rapid success of his teaching to the fact that he recognised as the surest means to his end, and established as a basis of his entire activity, scientific research into the grammar of all Slavonic languages, of course with Church Slavonic as the groundwork. He thus followed the path which Dobrovský had indicated and Vostokov had improved by his researches, but which the first Russian Slavists, to their own misfortune, had not followed. The grammatical studies of Miklosich assumed an entirely different form as a result of the progress recently made in comparative philology by Bopp, Pott, Benfey and others; and the first edition of his

Comparative Grammar exercised a reforming influence upon the grammatical treatment of most of the Slavonic languages. In a later edition of his "*Old Slovene*" *Laut- und Formenlehre*, Miklosich modified his former point of departure (from the Ostromir Gospel and the Codex Suprasliensis) and took as his foundation the oldest Glagolitic texts, in particular the Codex Zographensis, which I have myself made accessible to Slavonic philology. Although new grammatical works upon Old Church Slavonic have since appeared (Leskien, Vondrák, Sobolevsky, Kulbakin), the work of Miklosich still remains on the whole a rich mine of valuable information. By its side still stands his *Lexicon Linguae Palæo-slovenicæ*, as the richest lexicographical source for that language; Sreznevsky's dictionary of Old Russian forms a welcome supplement to it, but without superseding it.

It is hardly necessary, and within my present limits it would hardly be possible, to refer in detail to all the philological achievements of Miklosich. His admirable analysis of the whole Slavonic vocabulary in respect to foreign elements and the influence of neighbouring languages—Magyar, Roumanian, Albanian, Modern Greek—has no rival in the whole field of philological literature. For the language of the Gipsies Miklosich stands in the very front rank of research scholars. His *Monumenta Serbica* have not yet been superseded by any more comprehensive edition of the material, which since then has increased enormously. No less important are his various essays in Slavonic, and in particular Serbian and Bulgarian, popular epic poetry; it is true that he limited himself to the formal side of the subject, and did not deal with their contents and origin, or with the relations between legend and history.

One important circumstance characterises the attitude of the Viennese scholar to his subject: he was free to traverse its whole territory unhampered by considerations of this or that provincial language or its special claims,—which was by no means the case among the Russian Slavists, or, indeed, at the other universities of Austria where Slavonic Chairs came to be gradually erected. In Vienna there could only be Slavists of equal rank; "Bohemists" or "Polonists" there could not be. How the students might group themselves according to national affinities was their own affair, and scarcely concerned the representative of Slavonic studies. This free range over the whole subject may well have exercised a decisive attraction alike upon teacher and pupil. It would be easy to prove from the posthumous papers of Miklosich that his free intercourse

with the youth of the various Slav nationalities contributed materially to his researches and their success.

V.

While the success of Miklosich rapidly made of the Vienna Chair a centre of Slavistic studies—of course, particularly as regards philology—the development of this science at the other universities of the former Austro-Hungarian Monarchy followed quite different lines. The conditions prevailing there were similar to those at Russian Universities. In each case the language and history of the particular country were represented by special Chairs, and Slavistics appeared as a novelty which, it may be said, had to justify its very existence. In Galicia, in particular, at the two Polish Universities there prevailed much prejudice against Slavistics, as something identified with Russian Pan-Slavism. Thus I know that L. Malinowski in Cracow had a hard struggle against Count Tarnowski, although he really devoted himself merely to Polish dialects, rather than to general Slavistics. In the same way, Lemberg was dominated by the Polish grammarian Małecki. Even later, when Łoś was appointed to the Slavistic Chair at Cracow, general Slavonic studies were subordinated to Polish philology. Moreover, in Lemberg, Ruthene was to be given a place beside Polish, so that real Slavistics were confined within yet narrower limits. Only in Czernowitz and Graz was there some scope for Slavistics, though in the one case Ruthene and in the other Slovene were separated off. In the former University Slavistic studies were in the hands of Professor Kaluzniacki, in the latter of Professor Krek, author of the well-known *Einleitung in die slavische Literaturgeschichte*. There was also in Czernowitz a Professor of Ruthene, J. Smal-Stotsky, author of a recently published grammar of the Ruthene (or Ukrainian) language, who as an opponent both of Russian policy and of the Russian language, went so far as to attempt to prove that Ruthene is more closely related to Serbian than to Great Russian! In Graz, Slovene was to be represented by my own much lamented pupil, Dr. Oblak; but he died very early and was replaced, at first for Slovene and afterwards for general Slavistics, by Professor Štrekelj. Štrekelj, whose cautious etymological researches stand in good repute, also died young, and Slavistic studies were represented, first by M. Murko, who was afterwards transferred to Leipzig and is to-day in Prague, and then by R. Nachtigall, while Slovene was assigned to Dr. Ramovš, who is successfully

continuing the work begun by Dr. Oblak. Both these scholars are now at the new Slovene University of Ljubljana (Laibach), the first for general Slavistics, the second for the Slovene language. Apart from Vienna, in the years following upon 1848 Prague University, then still a single unit and predominantly German in character, was the first to be provided with a Slav Chair. Czech was already taught by Professor Koulek, a man of mediocre attainments. He stands far behind Jungmann, whose works in literary history and in particular his admirable dictionary of the Czech language, made of him the chief spokesman of Czech linguistic research after Dobrovský. For reasons which have not been completely cleared up, the Chair of Slavistics in Prague, when it came to be vacant, was not assigned to the only really qualified man, the famous author of *Slav Antiquities*, P. J. Šafařík, who had at this very period attracted fresh attention by his studies in comparative philology and who had been already invited to fill a Slavistic Chair in Berlin. Instead of him was appointed F. L. Čelakovsky, formerly professor in Breslau, whose poems in the Slav romantic style and whose preference for Slav popular poetry won general recognition, but who was utterly unequal to the new task which awaited him in Prague. His lectures on comparative Slav grammar followed poetical rather than scientific lines, and convinced such few and impartial, qualified critics as were then to be found, that his selection had been a blunder. Indeed, he was probably conscious of this himself.

Even after his death, in 1852, however, the authorities were not happy in their choice of his successor. The new professor was a Slovak priest and professor in the gymnasium at Pressburg,¹ Martin Hattala (1821-1903), who had attracted the attention of Prague by a few grammatical writings. He was greatly overrated, thanks possibly to his gift of biting criticism, which he was fond of employing on every possible occasion. He suffered from a megalomania which stood in inverted relation to his scientific achievements. He set himself, by spiteful polemics, to belittle and depreciate the greatest of the Slav philologists, notably Miklosich and Schleicher. The only contribution of his own, which is worth mentioning, is an essay on the treatment of groups of consonants in the various Slav languages. (*De Contiguarum Consonantium Mutatione*), by which he fancied himself to have filled a serious gap in Slav phonetics. For the rest his main work consisted in misleading

¹ Now Bratislava (in Magyar, Pozsony).

public opinion by a frequently repeated promise to demonstrate the genuine character of the *Königinhof* Manuscript and other forgeries. Thanks to this promise, which was never carried out, he was left free to abuse and insult Professor J. Gebauer, whose inquiries into the historical and grammatical development of the Czech language deserve very high praise; in his vanity Hattala presumably felt that Gebauer's conscientious research work was bound in the long run to deal a deathblow to the forgeries, as indeed actually happened. Moreover, Hattala did his best to accentuate the divergence between Vienna and Prague in Slavistic questions. The essence of the dispute may be said to have lain in Miklosich's use of the term "Old Slovene"—a term which he took over from the literary remains of his friend Kopitar—as opposed to the term "Old Bulgarian," preferred by Šafařík, Schleicher and others. The latter corresponded more closely to realities, even though in the earliest Slavonic documents the word employed was never "blgarsk" but "slovensk." It was only after Hattala's retirement and death that a better time dawned in Prague for Slavistic studies. Pastrnek and Polívka, who represent the linguistic and folklorist tendency respectively, were joined by Lubor Niederle, whose wide researches in Slavonic antiquities and anthropology make of him a worthy successor of Šafařík. In recent times it has become the aim of Prague to create at the Czech University an important centre of Slavonic studies interpreted in the widest sense, to include not merely linguistic research but archæology, history, ethnography and the study of all Slavonic literatures.

VI.

In the seventies the first period of Slavistic study gradually came to its close. The first generation of Russian Slavists had either died, like Grigorovich and Bodyansky, or reached the end of their activities, and new personalities appeared, with new opinions and ideals and also new requirements. In St. Petersburg the Slavophile doctrine represented by Vl. I. Lamansky grew steadily stronger; his supporters and pupils—Florinsky, Grot, Sokolov, Syrku and others, who were all very strongly influenced by him—threw themselves into the study of Slav legal, literary and political history, taking the Greco-Slav standpoint as their point of departure. In Warsaw, Perwolf, Kulakovsky and the legal historian Stegel followed more or less the same lines. The first of these studied the mutual

relations of the Slav peoples as revealed in history, the second enquired into the importance of Vuk for the Serbian language, and of Illyrism for the Southern Slavs as a whole, the third was for many years the only professor throughout the Russian Empire for the history of Slavonic Law. In Warsaw, Slavistic studies had a further representative in Professor Budilovich, whose ideal was the extension of the Russian Orthodox Autocracy to all the Slavs, and who showed special sympathy for the most helpless among the Western Slavs, with the idea that in their despair they would be ready to hand themselves over body and soul to the Russians. This was Budilovich's creed, as he very frankly expounded it to me in the spring of 1872, at the house of Sreznevsky. In Moscow, Bodjansky was succeeded by Duvernois, a man of French origin, to whom we owe among other things a modern Bulgarian dictionary, based upon popular sources. Nil Popov, a son-in-law of the Russian historian Solovyov, studied the modern history of Serbia, while a former pupil of Bodjansky, A. A. Maykov, produced a history of the Serbian language during the Middle Ages, based upon numerous Serbian documents, and furnished with an historical introduction. Russian Slavistics were materially strengthened by the representatives of Russian literature and language, whose investigations were closely bound up, and to a great extent ran parallel with, general Slavistic problems. Of the greatest possible value were the syntax studies of A. Potebnya, a professor at Kharkov University, whose studies in the field of Little Russian language and popular poetry (in particular of ritual folksongs) and their connection with the Song of Igor, belong to the best work of its kind. His colleague in Kharkov, M. Drinov, a Bulgarian by birth, passed in the Seventies as the best authority on the Bulgarian language and early history; during the Russian occupation of his native country he played an important part and did much for Bulgaria's cultural development, but afterwards withdrew from political life and went back to his Chair at Kharkov. In Kiev, as the centre for Southern Russia, the work of the first Russian Slavists was admirably continued by such men as Maksimovich and Kostomarov (the latter afterwards in St. Petersburg), the first voices crying in the wilderness in favour of Ukrainian individualism, which unfortunately met with general opposition, even in Moscow. In the next generation their scientific activities were continued by such competent men as Antonovich, Dragomanov and Zitetsky; but as their studies were directed towards the Little

Russian language, history and ethnography, they were persecuted by the narrow and suspicious Government.

In Moscow a dominant position was occupied by F. J. Buslayev, who by his studies in the field of Old Russian literature in its bearings on the history of art came to be regarded as the Russian counterpart of Grimm, whose methods and tendencies he followed. But this attempt to explain Russian popular traditions on a mythological basis was thrown over by his most gifted pupil A. N. Veselovsky, who diverted these studies into the direction followed by Benfey, and did wonderful work, without, however, being satisfied with his own conclusions. In the history of art Buslayev's best work related to the pictorial treatment of the Apocalypse, while another able pupil of his, N. P. Kondakov, investigated Byzantine architectural monuments and their influence among the Russians and Southern Slavs, with very fruitful results for Slavonic archæology. From the school of the Petersburg Byzantinist, V. G. Vasilyevsky, there came, among others, F. Uspensky, who at first dealt with the primitive history of the Western Slavs in the old Moravia, and afterwards turned to a minute study of the history of Bulgaria and its relations to Byzantium, especially from the social and agrarian side. He was for many years Director of the Russian Archæological Institute in Constantinople, and in its publications made many contributions of real value.

Thus in Russia the intellectual life which owed its origin to Slavistic studies developed on wide and varied lines, and at last Slavonic philology in the stricter sense also came into its own. R. F. Brandt, the Slavist appointed to Moscow after Duvernois' death, published—rather late in the day, it is true—an amplified Russian translation of Miklosich's *Vergleichende Laut- und Formenlehre*; and Professor Florinsky, in Kiev, a Comparative Slavonic Grammar of his own, which, unfortunately, left much to be desired. P. A. Lavrov, a pupil of the Moscow school, published a very useful introduction to the history of the Bulgarian language, based upon research into Bulgarian monuments. G. Ilyinsky, who I believe holds a post at Kharkov, is still an energetic worker; but his etymological theories are daring in the extreme. Much more conservative and less open to challenge are the researches of the former Professor in Kharkov, S. M. Kulbakin (now at the High School at Skoplje in Macedonia) in the field of Church Slavonic. Two other scholars in the third Russian generation have also contributed to the history of Slavistics. Nestor M. Petrovsky, of Kazan, who unfortunately

died young not long ago, produced a careful and useful study of Kopitar, while V. A. Frantsev (formerly in Warsaw and Rostov, now in Prague) has thrown much light upon Slavistic studies in Poland, as revealed in various literary correspondence. Similar work has been done for Russia by A. Kochubinsky, who followed Grigorovich in Odessa, but has also been long dead. Russian literary history, as placed in the setting of the whole Slavonic intellectual movement, owes an immense debt to A. N. Pypin, who belonged to the liberal school at St. Petersburg University in the Sixties and was victimised by the reactionary Government. Dismissed from the University he assured himself a means of living on the editorial staff of the *Vestnik Evropy* (European Messenger), a liberal review published by M. Stasyulyevich, who had likewise been dismissed from his post. Here he was for some decades the only one among the Russian Westernising Liberals who showed an interest in the fortunes of Slavdom. He wrote many informative essays about the intellectual life of the Slavs and the development of Pan-Slavism, and, in addition, a history of Russian literature in four volumes, and, with the Pole Spasowicz, a history of the non-Russian Slavonic literatures. It was only towards the close of his extremely busy life that he won recognition by his admission to the Academy of Sciences, where he was entrusted, among other things, with a critical edition of the works of Catherine the Great. This was intended to be a monumental edition, similar to that of Derzhavin by the former Academician, J. K. Grot, and that of Pushkin, planned but not completed by the Academician J. P. Sukhomlinov. Good work has recently been done in Russian literary history by M. N. Speransky in Moscow and Petukhov in St. Petersburg.

Slavistic studies were further strengthened by the researches of Professor Fil. Fed. Fortunatov, of Moscow, in the field of comparative philology; his comparison of Lithuanian and Slavonic led to important results in Slav phonetics. Unfortunately, he procrastinated to an unusual degree and left many of his conclusions unpublished for years. Indeed, it was only by actually hearing his lectures or making his personal acquaintance that it was possible to realise his keen powers of observation and his mastery of interrelated details. To him and his no less stimulating colleague, F. E. Korsh, we owe the training of one of the most competent scholars in the whole field of Russian language and early monuments, the academician Al. Al. Shakhmatov, whose death from exhaustion during the

period of Russia's agony is an irreparable loss for philological studies. He had planned on big lines a history of the Russian language, from the earliest prehistoric period onwards; but the work has unhappily remained a torso, and it will be long before it is continued in the way it was originally conceived. Professor A. Sobolevsky, the representative of Russian linguistic teaching at Petrograd University and in the Academy, has acquired great merit by his untiring research into early Russian sources, and by continuing the work begun by Buslayev, of classifying and dividing the immensely rich material at his disposal. It is possible that the limits set by him to the subject will require to be modified in certain directions, but this will in no way diminish his credit. Finally, on the grammatical side very good work has been done by Professor Bogoroditsky, of Kazan, who lays special stress upon the physiological influences on various sounds.

VII.

The seventies of last century are also noticeable for the increase in the number of Slavistic Chairs. In 1847 a Slavistic Chair was founded at the University of Berlin on the Viennese model, and filled by a pupil of Miklosich (the writer of this article). Without being immodest I may perhaps claim some credit for the decision to publish in the very next year (1875) a central organ for Slav philology, using German as an international language. In this I was assisted by a pupil of Schleicher, A. Leskien, who had shortly before been appointed to the new Slavistic Chair in Leipzig, and by Wl. Nehring, the holder of a mainly Polish Chair at Breslau. In spite of my being twice transferred to other universities (St. Petersburg, 1880; Vienna, 1886) the review which I founded—*Archiv für Slavische Philologie*—continued to appear uninterruptedly, and by the end of 1920 had reached its thirty-seventh volume. Then the publisher came to the end of his resources, and my chief work for over forty years (1875-1920) had to be abandoned—to be revived, perhaps, in the near future with fresh strength and energy.¹

In the same year (1874) a Chair of Slavistics was established at the new University of Zagreb (Agram) and was filled by the Prague scholar L. Geitler, who began by deriving the Glago-

¹ The modesty of our distinguished contributor has here left a serious gap in an otherwise admirably balanced survey. This gap, however, we hope to fill at a later date by an article devoted to his own achievements in the field of Slavonic scholarship—ED.

litic alphabet from Albanian and defending the authenticity of the Verković Veda-Songs; but afterwards atoned for these aberrations by a successful visit to Sinai, whence he returned with a transcription of two important Slav texts, the Glagolitic Euchologium and Psalter, both published by the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences in Zagreb (Agram). At the Vienna University, to which I was appointed in 1886, I succeeded in founding a Seminar, well supplied with books—to a large extent presented by Slavonic Academies and learned Societies—and in securing in the person of Professor Constantine Jireček an admirable exponent of the history of the Balkan Peninsula. After my retirement from the University in 1908, the chair of Slavistic philology was transformed into two chairs, one for the Western Slavs, the other for the Eastern and Southern Slavs. The study of Old Church Slavonic was entrusted to Professor Vondrák, the author of a grammar in that language already in its second edition, and also of a comparative grammar of all the Slav languages, which follows different principles from those of the great work of Miklosich.

The foundation of the new Academies of Sciences in Cracow and in Prague, as well as the Serbian in Belgrade and the Bulgarian in Sofia, and the strengthening of the activity of the Shevchenko Society in Lemberg—all this strengthened the position of Slavistic studies, which, moreover, began to receive more attention abroad. In Copenhagen a Chair of Slavonic languages was founded for the well-known Germanist Verner, while in Upsala a similar post was filled by Lundell, who specialises on the physiological side, and in Christiania by that equally acute student of dialectical distinctions, Olaf Broch, who has carried out with great skill and success various dialectical enquiries entrusted to him by the Viennese Academy of Science and the Russian section of the Petrograd Academy. In Oxford, and still more recently in Leyden, Slavistic Chairs were established, while these studies are ably represented in Finland by Professor Mikkola. Slavistic studies have suffered a great loss by the death of the Bucarest scholar, Ion Bogdan, and of Professor Oskar Asbóth of Budapest.

In recent times there has also been a considerable increase in the number of periodicals whose columns are opened to Slavonic studies. The veteran Czech review *Časopis*, published by the Bohemian Museum, has been supplemented by the *Listy Filologické* and the *Review of Modern Philology*. In Cracow the *Rocznik Slawistyczny* continues to flourish, and the review

Prace has been transferred from that city to Warsaw. In Russia the *Russky Filologicheskyy Vestnik*, founded in Warsaw by K. Kolosov, has acquired increasing importance, though latterly the *Izvestia* of the Academy was a serious competitor. It is scarcely possible to summarise the material published by the various Russian Universities. Moreover, every Academy has what may be called its own organ—in Prague, the *Sborník Filologický*; in Zagreb, the *Rad*; in Belgrade, the *Glas* and *Spomenik*, etc. Even the Slovenes founded a *Časopis* a few years ago, and the *Živinoslovenski Filolog*, founded before the war, has now been revived in Belgrade. There are also numerous publications devoted to Slavonic ethnography, which contain many valuable sources for philological enquiry. A new central organ for Slav philology and ethnography, amply endowed on the material side, is about to appear in Prague under the title *Slavia*; may it succeed not merely in replacing but outdistancing the *Archiv für Slavische Philologie*, whose resources were always of a modest nature! In Paris, a Slavistic Review has recently been founded under that well-tried philologist Meillet, and now England is eager not to remain behind. May all these organs of scientific Slav studies work harmoniously together to secure for the subject which they have at heart new contributors and new friends!

This brief survey of the achievements of a science which can only boast a century of life gives the impression of an eager, rushing stream, which readily overflows its still unregulated banks and is in urgent need of regulation. This might best be attained by a discussion, whether written or oral, of the whole subject, a definition of its frontiers and its inner organisation. *Quod bonum faustum felix fortunatumque sit.*

V JAGIĆ

THE OBJECTIVES OF RUSSIAN STUDY IN BRITAIN.

It is in the light of the three opening articles that we envisage our task in London.

British interest in Russia, which is the principal subject of this article, began, with the first relations between the two countries, not in the province of Slavistic philological studies, nor even in that of *Slavyanovyyedenie* or the study of Slavonic countries, but rather only in *Russovyedenie* or the study of Russia. The British were interested in Russia first as explorers and later as traders and observers. As observers the British in Russia were some of the most clear-headed and objective, and the books of Horsey (1584) and Giles Fletcher continue to be valuable as sources of Russian history.

It was in this same province of open-minded and clear-headed observation that in our times Russia, as a country, was made interesting to Englishmen by Sir Donald Mackenzie Wallace. His book is for modern British scholars a first chart of exploration in *Russovyedenie*. The writer's execution of this task remains much the best and broadest piece of work yet done by an Englishman on Russia. The next landmark in British study of Russia is Dr. Harold Williams's singularly able sketch, entitled "Russia of the Russians." There is as yet no other landmark; and between and about these two there are a number of other books which mark the progress from observation to scholarship—essays in the study of various aspects of Russian life—nearly all of them still *Russovyedenie* or the study of Russia as a country. Such are Mr. W. J. Birkbeck's work on the Russian Church, Mr. Aylmer Maude's *Life of Tolstoy*, Mr. F. H. Skrine's handbook on the Expansion of Russia, and his work on the Heart of Asia, written in collaboration with Dr. (now Sir) E. Denison Ross, Mr. Maurice Baring's talented and illuminating sketches of Russian life and literature—in particular of Dostoyevsky—and Mr. Stephen Graham's tramps in Russia and to Jerusalem. Closer to the aims and methods of scholarship are the historical and geographical works of Mr. J. F. Baddeley on the Caucasus, Central Asia, Mongolia and China, the late Mr. Nisbet Bain's historical studies, Mrs. Newmarch's critical

studies of Russian music, and, perhaps closest of all, the brilliant translations from the Russian made by Mrs. Constance Garnett.

This was the most that was to be expected. England proper possessed till near the end of the last century practically only two teaching universities, and these were accessible only to few of those who had not large means. Of the two, only Oxford found any room for so modern a subject as Russia; but Professor Morfill of Oxford, besides excursions in the history of Slavonic literature, did make a beginning in the study of Slavonic philology and left a trained and competent successor.

The succeeding period has already seen the number of universities in England and Wales increased to ten—a fact which will be recognised as full of importance for the future. At the same time the minimum cost of a university education has in many cases been reduced by seven-eighths. It is the generation thus trained which is now finding its way into all the departments of public life. The new universities owe their existence to city communities, and this origin has had much to do with the modernising of all programmes of study. Another influence in the same direction has been the growth during this same period of extra-mural teaching and, in particular, the contact which all the universities, both old and new, have thus obtained with the working classes.

It was in such an atmosphere, at the new and vigorous University of Liverpool, that there was founded in 1907 a School of Russian Studies. It was important that this was both a Higher School and a department of an ordinary University. It was able to subserve the needs of other departments and to draw from them students for itself. On the other hand, as a Higher School with a definite task, it could begin to differentiate between various Slavonic subjects and provide teaching in each. It had at different times teaching posts in Russian language, literature, history, laws and institutions, economic conditions, and in the literature and history of the Western Slavs. It was also able to associate, for the publication of a *Russian Review*, most of the scattered Russian scholars of England, and a number of most valuable corresponding members in Russia itself.

In 1914 there were four other university teaching posts in these subjects in Great Britain—two Readerships in Oxford and Cambridge and Lectureships in London and Manchester. The Oxford Readership, held by a pupil of Professor Morfill, Dr. Nevill Forbes, was in Slavonic languages; the other posts were in Russian. The war, with the great interest in Russia which it produced

especially in commercial communities, brought about the creation of new posts in several universities: professorships of Russian Language and Literature in Birmingham, Manchester, Leeds and University College, Nottingham (Leeds has so far only appointed a Head of Department), a lectureship in the same subject at Glasgow, and a lectureship in Russian at Sheffield; the Glasgow lecturer holds classes also in Edinburgh University. During the present session the Chair of Professor Morfill, which lapsed at his death, has been restored at Oxford and has been conferred on Dr. Forbes, a long-deserved promotion.

The other principal development of the war has been the creation of a School of Slavonic Studies on the Liverpool model in the University of London (Liverpool retains a professor of Russian Language and Literature and a lecturer in Russian). This was the work of Dr. Ronald Burrows, Principal of King's College, who grasped at once the opportunity of developing both the teaching of modern languages and the study of modern nations. His own province was Modern Greece and he founded a Chair of Modern Greek, which was conferred on a historian, Professor Arnold Toynbee. Spanish studies were also developed by him, though they did not (so far) go beyond the language and literature. Slavonic studies were at first represented by Professor Masaryk and Dr. Seton-Watson, with two teachers of Russian, and others of Polish, Serbian and Bulgarian. This School now possesses teaching posts in the following subjects: Comparative Slavonic philology, Russian language, literature, history, laws and institutions, and economic conditions, Central European history (a Chair held by Professor R. W. Seton-Watson), Polish, Czechoslovak and Serbo-Croat language and literature. Roughly, except for the first-named subject, it is divided into two departments, Russian and Central European with a sub-department (so far weakly developed) of Polish.

If one were to ask an ordinary Englishman, especially in the provinces, what he conceived to be the duties of a Professor of Russian, the reply would probably be, that he teaches Russian, particularly for commercial purposes and can answer questions on Russia. No philology would be implied, nor any differentiation between Russian literature, history and economics. Yet these subjects are as various as they would be in the case of England, and just as exacting in their demand for special knowledge. One must realise that if one undertakes nation-study, the differentiation between widely different subjects is not to be escaped. It is specially the task of our School of Slavonic Studies.

Let us see on what lines it is being attempted. First we separate from everything else the language, conceived purely as a means of study. This work should properly be done in a secondary school. As it is seldom done there, we have to do it in the universities; and, without this foundation, we cannot get on to anything else. The standard is, efficiency in the use of the language; but this standard can be a high one, and all our oral examinations are partly conducted in the language concerned. For ordinary language teaching we follow the Direct Method: that is to say, the instruction is given in the language which is being studied.

This separation once made, we are set free to put the further studies into their proper categories. We give to our students for Honours a choice between two sets of subjects, the first pair concerned more particularly with the language and the second with the country concerned. The first pair are philology and literature; the second, history and economics: with the latter are associated laws and institutions. In each pair the student must choose one subject for principal study, the other becoming subsidiary. Thus the student of philology takes, for instance, the early period of Russian literature and also studies comparative Slavonic philology: he has to present another non-Slavonic language, preferably German. The student of literature takes, for instance, a modern period of Russian literature, the history of Russian literary criticism, and must have some knowledge of some other modern European literature.

The course of history and economics (or nation-study) has rather more in common throughout. It includes history, economic history, and laws and institutions. But whereas the specialist in history offers also a special period, some literature and modern European history—the economist presents economic geography, a special subject of economics (either agriculture, industry, transport or finance), and a knowledge of general economic history and organisation in the *xix*th century. In the case of the smaller Slavonic countries, the course of nation-study includes some knowledge both of the history of the language and of the larger historical units with which the nation concerned has been associated—for instance, Austria-Hungary or in the case of Poland, the three partitioning Powers: here a knowledge of German is practically obligatory.

I would ask a little consideration of this “delimitation of frontiers.” There is probably a greater distinctiveness between the philological mind and that of the literary critic than there

is between those of the historian and the economist ; but philology and literature are almost interdependent, and their connection presents no difficulty. On the other hand, as soon as one attacks " nation-study "—that is, the study of one nation in the country of another—one has, for practical purposes, to eliminate those subjects which can be left to general categories. I will repeat that there are as many subjects relating to the life of Russia as there are relating to the life of England. We shall not, for instance, try to set up a lectureship on Russia's achievement in chemistry : we should rather try to induce a chemist to learn Russian and study the subject ; our principal contribution would simply be the language as a means of study. A lectureship in Slavonic art we could only allow ourselves as a luxury. Besides language and literature, the principal of those subjects which, if studied at all, must generally be related to some definite part of the earth's surface, can more or less be brought within a wide definition of history and economics ; and these two subjects are themselves closely interrelated.

That is as far as our infant School has so far gone in this matter. We have learned enough to see that any sound definition is a charter of liberation for the student, who is thereby cleared of confusion and set free to specialise, and that this, in an inexperienced country like our own, is the first step towards obtaining true standards of scholarship in any of the provinces of our wide field of study. We have every reason, therefore, respectfully to repeat the desire for the demarcation of frontiers which has been expressed by Professor Jagić.

The proper demarcation makes possible the proper relations between our School and other departments of the University—relations which may in each case be very useful to both parties concerned. This raised for us, even in the Liverpool period, the question whether it were better to have an independent institution, or to be attached to a university. When I met German scholars in our subject during my frequent visits to Berlin, this was just the question which they discussed with me. For a less known subject like our own we have always found that the closest possible contact with a working university was invaluable—we experience the advantage of it almost every day. Often we may have to send our students to other departments—for instance, for the study of German or of some other literature, of modern European history, or of general economic theory and organisation. While we have contact with all other departments—for instance, with science—we are able to work out plans by which

specialists in many different subjects can secure that knowledge of the language and even of the country which will enable them to apply their knowledge—for instance, to Russia. We are always seeking such specialists to cover various provinces of Russian learning; for instance, we can only hope to continue and develop the work of the late Mr. W. J. Birkbeck when we have a post-graduate student of theology who is willing to devote himself to the study of the Russian Orthodox Church. Further, it is anything but a negligible advantage to our teachers and our students that they are able to take part in the life of a great university.

There has always been close co-operation in Slavonic Studies between the different British Universities: one factor which has helped this is that most of our colleagues are personal friends, and this is largely due to the fuller development of the subject in one university—first in Liverpool and then in London—and to the publication work of the *Russian Review*, which, among other things, kept a register of all teachers of and translators from Russian in Great Britain. The Scottish Universities form a natural group with traditions and habits of their own, and, as has been mentioned, it is the lecturer in Glasgow who conducts the work in Edinburgh. The new universities of the North of England form another natural group of much later origin, and various methods of co-operation have been discussed between them. Railway distances are not such as to prevent a lecturer in one northern university from visiting the students of another. As differentiation of studies is here hardly practicable, it is all the more valuable that a professor who is a specialist—say, in Russian history—should be able to address the students of another university in which the Russian professor is primarily an economist. By mutual arrangement Honours students, who are always few in number, can be directed to that university which gives most attention to their special aspect of Slavonic Studies. Even in appointments to posts it is possible to bear in mind the nature of teaching which has already been provided in neighbouring universities. As the northern universities have a combined Board of Matriculation, such relations are all the more natural.

During the last session two conferences of all the universities concerned with Slavonic Studies were held in London. A standing committee was appointed to maintain regular communications, and a philological committee, whose conclusions were adopted by the conference, established a common attitude towards the transliteration of Russian words and towards the

question of the new spelling in Russian. Two members of the conference act as a bibliographical commission and answer any questions addressed to them by their colleagues. The librarian of our School, Mr. L. Wharton of the British Museum, is engaged in making a Union catalogue to record all volumes on Slavonic subjects which are to be found in the various libraries of London. A similar conference will be held at the end of this session.

The interest in "nation-study" had been prepared in England for several years before the war and was not peculiar to Slavonic studies. This generation has witnessed the appearance of an unusually large number of studies of other peoples. With Sir D. M. Wallace's book on Russia may be mentioned the work of Mr. J. C. Bodley on France, of Mr. H. W. Steed on Austria-Hungary, of Mr. G. M. Trevelyan and Mr. Bolton King on Italy, and of Mr. J. W. Headlam-Morley on Germany; one might name several others, for there sprang up a whole school of students in these subjects. Consequently the study of peoples began to find a place beside the study of languages in university examinations, of which in this respect those of Cambridge were perhaps the most interesting example. All knowledge of this kind came to be of great importance both to the government and to the public during the war. In August, 1916, the Prime Minister appointed a very authoritative Committee to examine the position of modern languages in the educational system of Great Britain. The Chairman of this Committee was Sir Stanley Leathes, formerly one of the editors of the Cambridge Modern History, and now Senior Civil Service Commissioner for the examinations of the government. Sir Stanley Leathes had long been one of the principal champions of nation-study and the Committee was practically unanimous in recommending its further development; the lines of division of subjects which it followed were practically those which have already been described. In fact, the Committee practically substituted for the words "Modern Languages" as contained in its terms of reference, the expression "Modern Studies." It recommended the establishment in London of an Institute for the development, on these lines, of instruction on lesser-known countries; and to this recommendation was largely due the support which the School of Slavonic Studies has received from the British Government.

These attempts to chart our course had to take precedence of everything else. The organisation of studies has to proceed first by the prescription of curricula and then by the corresponding appointment of teachers. The practical objects of

our work may be described as twofold. It is the task of the school, through its different specialists, to raise the standard of knowledge accessible in England, and to train men for service in Slavonic countries.

It is not too much to say that the measure of England's understanding of Russia will in the long run be fixed by the standard of work of Honours students in the British universities. If this were denied anywhere, it would be in England itself, where the generation educated in the new or revived universities is only now beginning to enter Parliament. Till quite lately debates on Russia, or even debates on education itself, have been amazing in their confusion and ignorance, and for a long time it was the same with the materials on Russia printed in our best newspapers. The report of the Committee already mentioned has truly described this ignorance as "abysmal." Yet I venture to think that there is no country which is more governed by public opinion than Great Britain, and that there is no better educational material, no body of men better able to form an intelligent objective and balanced judgment than the working classes of Scotland and England. Once knowledge of a subject is made accessible, in the long run every speaker in Parliament, every writer in the press is forced to reckon with it. The value to a country such as ours of an intelligent opinion on foreign affairs was one of the principal themes of the report of the Committee.

When we pass to the consideration of training for foreign service, emphasis must be laid upon a fundamental feature in the life of Russia which is seldom realised in other countries. The first need of Russia, as known to all Russians, has always been the need of "men." Serfdom was the submersion of the Russian people; it deprived both master and serf of any school of real responsibility and initiative. Consequently every intelligent Russian ruler has despairingly complained of the absence of conscientious and competent agents: *net pomoshchnikov, net lyudey*. The tasks which faced the government were, before all things, really questions of commonplace economics; yet there was no real economic policy and hardly any supply of competent public servants.

The Russian Government might remain indifferent to the fundamental iniquities which deprived it of that atmosphere in which responsible public servants could be bred, but it could not disregard the pressing need for such workers. Each time that the hopelessly belated work of economic progress was

taken up, it became inevitable to seek at short notice ready-made experts from abroad. So it was with Peter the Great, Catherine the Great, and every other Russian ruler who wished the development of Russia's vast economic resources. Even so, the supply of workers could never keep pace with the demand, and even such a period of economic progress as that of Count Witte could only make Russia's need of trained men seem all the greater. The more was done, the more there was to do.

In the long run, it is before all things in this light that we must contemplate the losses suffered by Russia in the war. In the period following the emancipation of the serfs in 1861 and the establishment of local self-government on the elective principle, individual enterprise and initiative in Russia, above all in the field of economics, were throughout on the up-grade. We are proud to think that this was the period which led to Russia's friendship with England, and indeed it could not have been otherwise. Those were Russia's friends who wished that she should have a voice of her own ; and that voice, as soon as she had it, declared for friendship with our country. Meanwhile the economic development of Russia, so rapid because it was so belated, changed all values there ; in such a period lethargy and indifference were fatal, and all foreign enterprise in Russia which had not the wit to go forward, would be sooner or later forced to go out. Fully alive to this, German energy and enterprise everywhere went forward, and everywhere took up the most commanding commercial positions for the future. But German organisation under Prussian leadership sought something like a monopoly, and the war of 1914 was for most patriotic Russians, including even the more intelligent of the peasants, a defiance of such a monopoly, the reply to an economic challenge which was more grave than the political. The war led, as it was bound to lead, to a collapse of the effete autocratic system of the Tsars, which fell by its own weight ; and for a moment it seemed to bring the consummation of everything for which nearly all enlightened persons had been longing for over fifty years. Then came the failure of the inexperienced Provisional Government before an elemental cry for peace, in a country whose political organisation had cracked. A new small group, much less numerous than that of the Tsarist period, but ably and unscrupulously led, was able to capture the central machinery of government and, under principles which were least of all applicable to Russia and which represented a more exaggerated centralisation than any in the past, the country passed through

economic ruin, a reign of terror, pestilence and famine, from which it is only now beginning painfully to seek an issue. Russia's economic weakness, her consequent dependence on other countries and their complete ignorance of her conditions have only complicated the tragedy.

Let us see the effect of all this on Russia's supply of public servants. The upward movement had certainly produced many more, but their number was still altogether out of proportion to the economic needs of the country. They were now literally mown down in the colossal losses of the war, and in the subsequent movement of extermination directed against the educated class as such. The true tragedy of this was in the annihilation, not of Octobrists, Cadets or Socialist Revolutionaries—for Russian party names have had but little real meaning—but of priests, school-masters, chemists, doctors, agricultural experts and engineers.

It was never a question whether the vain experiment of Bolshevism could succeed in Russia. The main question was always, whose should be the hands which should build up again better than before what this experiment had thrown down. Russia's own supply of professional public servants has been almost wiped out. It is all important that what remains of it should be salvaged. Russia's political future depends in the first place on how much of the work of restoration is to be performed by Russian hands. But now, more than ever, especially in the first stages of reconstruction, the supply of trained Russians must be hopelessly inadequate.

The call for foreign experts must be infinitely larger than ever before; and for Russia there are two fateful questions involved in it. First, will the helpers come from one country or from several? Will one country be able to create an economic monopoly and domination? Or will Russia, by the very fact that she herself chooses her helpers from those quarters which can best supply her needs, be able to assert her own economic independence? It is on this element of choice that the issue hangs. Secondly, will the helpers come only to seek their own advantage, or will they realise that it is by helping Russia that they can best help themselves? European peace or war in the future depend on the answers to these questions.

Two answers have been given, one of which comes from Germany. No one will have forgotten the cynical avowal of General Hoffmann, that he launched Lenin against the Russian army "as a poison gas." Seeing that the result was the dissolution not only of the Russian front but of the Russian community,

a German writer, "Werner Daya," put forward as early as 1917 a reasoned programme for a German monopoly of Russia, and more particularly of Siberia—even more cynically declaring that of more friendly relations with the Russian people "one does not need to think." The principles contained in this programme were put to a partial application in the abortive treaty of Brest-Litovsk. Since then, the same idea has been very often repeated, and is much more than suggested by the recent Treaty of Rapallo. There are very various currents of thought in Germany, and we do not wish to suppose that all Germans would identify themselves with this idea: both before, during and since the war we have welcomed among our corresponding members names honoured in the German academic world. But the programme of exploitation and monopoly of Russia we regard as an act of war—of war in peace-time: and we stand for the economic independence of Russia, which, among other things, we regard as necessary to our own national safety. There is no question at all in our minds as to the absolute necessity of German cooperation in the work of Russian reconstruction; but the helpers of Russia must go there to help Russia on to her own legs, and they must come from all those countries from which Russians need help.

The turn which things have now taken in Russia gives more and more foundation for this second and better alternative. The life of the country is, so to speak, untwisting itself. Everyone is utterly tired, not only of convulsions and of theories, but of all politics. To use a Russian expression, "life is claiming its own." The urgent economic needs of the country have not only deprived the Soviet Government of all basis in public opinion, but have compelled it to make large concessions to private initiative in economic affairs, as the only condition on which it can hope to remain in power. Even the higher ranks of the Communist hierarchy are being gradually penetrated by men who have an open disregard for Communism, but have expert knowledge which the country cannot do without. Meanwhile decentralisation is setting in more and more, and centralised authority is lapsing of itself. There are many incidents which recall the beginning of the liberation movement of 1905. The very violence of Bolshevik rule has driven the country back into that upward movement which began in 1861, with this difference, that the prolonged struggle between ordinary human nature and the harsh and perpetual intrusion of communist tyranny into every sphere of life, has had a far more educative

result than the much more superficial experience of oppression under the autocracy of the Tsars. Many signs seem to show that we are nearer than ever before to the aspiration which was almost universal before the war and can alone settle all Russia's difficulties—free local self-government, free local economic initiative, a federative tie, and the United States of Russia.

On our side, too, it is now better understood that the reconstruction of Russia is much less a political question than a business one. There may yet be plenty of twists and turns, but Genoa is anyhow a bankruptcy of bluff and trick-riding, and further discussion at the Hague will go, if at all, on a business basis. The first men into Russia from Europe will be the professional experts, because both government and people are agreed that they cannot do without them. Business firms will follow, in the measure that they may find by experience that there exist the conditions of business confidence. Governments will then find it simple enough to frame policies which square with existing facts.

In any case it is the professional expert and not the diplomat who will in future carry the flag of Britain in Russia : and it is, therefore, essential that he should be properly trained. Three years ago I was supplied with as authoritative data as I could desire as to the existing needs of professional service in Russia. First of all come engineers of all specialities, in particular for railways, roads, irrigation, municipal services, and the setting up of agricultural or factory machinery. Certain branches of chemistry are also prominent, and organisers of all kind are required. But besides their specialities, these experts must understand the language which they will have to use and the conditions of the country in which they are to serve, and that training must be begun not when they are wanted, but now. Apart from the service of Russia, there is also the whole of our British service to be restored there, whether of our government, our trade or our press, besides teaching posts in our language and literature, which were fairly numerous in the past and are likely, unless we neglect our opportunities, to be much more so in the future.

In addition to this, any but the most short-sighted will perceive that it is the simplest economy to train in Great Britain for the future service of their country the Russians of school or university age who are living among us. In their case, the study of Russia, which they would not need to find here, might well

be replaced by a course in Civics, and a good part of their training should be practical—for instance, it might be combined with service in the institutions of some local government authority.

This last is a matter which does not directly touch our own School, and here we can do no more than act as intermediaries. We should be happy if Britain could follow, even at a distance, the magnificent act of statesmanship of the Czecho-Slovak Government, when it founded last year a new Russian University in Prague, as well as an Ukrainian University. We are at least deeply concerned with that unity and brotherhood of the Slavonic world which is figured forth in this act, and which is also the uniting bond of all our work. The best comfort that we have in the Russian tragedy is that it has synchronised with the resurrection of an independent Czecho-Slovak State, won, not by numbers, but by the moral content of its people—a quality which counts for more than anything else in the task of recovery which all friends of Russia have now to face.

For Russia, the question of the future is before all things a question of men—that is, not merely of special knowledge but of character. Technical knowledge has sometimes been attended to in the past, but it is only now that Russia is beginning her education in individual character. In the ocean of talk and theories, character, where it is to be found, has always counted for more than anything else: in fact it is the only thing that has counted at all. We ask for our School live men, not hacks: men who will put their lives into their work. The creation of character has always been the task to which our country has given its closest attention. If freedom means anything, it means the respect which the individual feels for the freedom of others: and to train that instinct has been the main purpose of our political history. Thus, even at the worst times and with the least preparation, our Englishmen have at least understood that the direct appeal to the goodwill of a Russian is to treat him not as an inferior but as a man. In dealing with Russians, that is the whole of the simple riddle. And equally simple is the charm which Russia has always, even in this time of dissolution, exercised over all Englishmen who have lived there; its explanation is that we have always found in the Russian character the fullest and frankest response to the instinct which I have described. I do not think that there is any pleasure which appeals more to a Russian than to share in the doing of something which brings as much benefit to his comrade as it does to himself.

Anyhow that is what I have found in many years of close intercourse with Russians, and it ought to be a good foundation for a free and happy people. Such, in particular, is the Russian peasant who is now the acknowledged conqueror of communism; and such is also the genius of Russian Co-operation, which is, I think, a better germ of the new Russia than anything else which has so far presented itself. The Russian peasant, by his practical instinct of brotherhood, is capable of doing remarkable things whenever he can free himself from a superimposed dead weight of political theory, whether autocratic or communist, and is left to manage his own local affairs, the detail of which he very well understands. I have been privileged to see him in many different surroundings, and at last, as if to challenge any possibility of despair of him, in the amazing sacrifice of the war; and I believe that, as time goes on, his outline will become clearer to us, not merely as till now by a thousand imponderable inferences, but that it will stand out, past the screen of artificial bureaucracies, in all its varied wealth of light and shade, and that Europe will be the richer for what it has to show her.

BERNARD PARES.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE EARLIER RUSSIAN CHRONICLES.

OF the facts which first strike the student of Russian literature one of the most obvious, but not one of the least interesting, is the want of balance among the periods and in the development of Russian literature as a whole. Noticeable in itself, this becomes all the more so when he comes to compare, as he inevitably must, the history and development of Russian literature with those of the other nations and peoples of Europe, past and present, great and small.

For centuries he sees the untold masses of the Russian people spread out among their forests, their clearings, their swamps, fighting against climate, against nature, against foreign invaders, supporting their rulers and themselves as best they might. Hardly an individual among them appears to give voice to their thoughts, their feelings, or their aspirations. They are merely toiling and almost completely voiceless. The Church is fanatically didactic and punitive, ascetic in its teaching, and repressive of all that there was of spontaneous and indigenous profane art. The lay ruling classes are equally unproductive of individual literary talent. Then, in the eighteenth century, comes the great pseudo-classic Gallophil masquerade of Russian society, with its crop of odes, satires, epics, and dramas; individual writers in plenty, but hardly any individuality. Finally, in the XIXth century, with the spread of reading and writing, the pent-up thought and speech of ages burst forth and poured out in an irresistible and inexhaustible flood. When once the Russians started writing, there was no stopping them.

These impressive contrasts are naturally to be explained by the course of Russian historical development: the peculiar geographical, economic, and political conditions, combined with the peculiar and intellectually deadening influence of the Eastern Church, as long as it was the unique and supreme force in Russian life, and the cultural divorce from the rest of Europe throughout the Middle Ages, which was the lamentable result. But while in mediæval Russia there is this remarkable dearth of individuality in literary expression, there are, to set against it, two copious

stores of corporate, un-individual, and mainly anonymous literature, which are intensely interesting, and supremely important, not only from the linguistic, literary, and artistic points of view, but also as illustrative of Russian history, especially social and cultural history; these are the folk-epics and the chronicles.

The folk-epics originated among the more articulate and eloquent members of the *lay* ruling class; that is to say, among those members of the princely courts who had an instinctive gift for narrative poetry, mainly epic in character, but very lyrical in colouring, who later came to form a professional class. This kind of poetry was fundamentally historical, descriptive of historical happenings, but coloured by myths and by certain non-Russian influences. Also it was oral and anonymous. These are the so-called *byliny* or *bylevoy epos*—that is, narrations of real happenings, as opposed to the *skazki* or folk-tales in prose, which were mainly fantastic in character. The *skazki* form an important branch of early Russian literature, also oral and anonymous, but are historically less important than the *byliny*.

The chronicles, on the other hand, originated among the more educated of the *ecclesiastical* ruling class, in the monasteries and among the clergy of the big metropolitan churches. Fundamentally and mainly by their nature historical, these chronicles contain a large admixture of tradition and legend, and of didactic, moralising, and sometimes almost lyrical outbursts on the part of the scribe, and, though for the most part anonymous, the personal note is often very distinct.

The Russian chronicles are not, as superficially they seem, and as at one time they were thought to be, connected, continuous, and complete compositions by single individuals, but mosaics of bare facts, personal recollections, moral disquisitions, short lives of eminent princes and holy men in old Russia, genuine historical documents, well-founded traditions, international myths, apocryphal legends, political propaganda, and what not. This has been definitely established by careful textual criticism and the comparison of the various texts; though, indeed, it is evident to any serious reader.¹

It is now established that at certain definite dates certain historical compilations were made by certain people, the first going back long beyond the personal recollection of the author,

¹ This very obscure process, the study of which is not yet completed, is most clearly explained by V. Keltuyala in his admirable *History of Russian Literature*, St. Petersburg, 1913, to which work, and also personally to the late Professor Shakhmatov, I am indebted for much of my information.

and terminating at some particular point in his career, while this first compilation formed the kernel and foundation of the second, the second of the third, and so on—each subsequent author interpolating and altering at will, in the light of his wider and more up-to-date historical knowledge.

The trouble is that, as a result of this “snow-ball” method of compilation, it is a matter of considerable difficulty to disinter the various component fragments and establish their origin. The authorship is in most cases impossible to discover, and conventional titles have had to be given to the fragments in order to distinguish them.

Another trouble is that none of the compilations or of their component parts have survived in the originals. The earliest copy which has survived, called the *Lavrentyevsky spisok* or “copy,” after the Monk Laurence (Lavrentiy) who copied it and inscribed his name at the end, dates from 1377; the second oldest, called the *Ipatsky spisok*, after the *Ipatsky* or *Ipatyevsky*¹ monastery in the government of Kostroma, where it was found, dates from the end of the XIVth or beginning of the XVth century. Both these “codices” (*svody*) are in themselves composed of distinct parts; the main part of the *Lavrentyevsky* is followed by a continuation, the chronicle known as that of *Suzdal*, the *Ipatsky* by two continuations, those known as the chronicles of Kiev and of Volhynia-Galicia. What is termed the “main part” of each of these codices is the historical compilation known as the *Povest vremennykh let*, or the “Tale of bygone years.” This title was given to this work at the time it was made, and is inscribed at the beginning of each of these two earliest extant codices. The date of the composition of *Povest vremennykh let* is supposed to have been between the years 1113 and 1116. In the form in which it appears in the *Lavrentyevsky spisok* it is known as the “Codex of Sylvester” (*Silvestrov svod*). In this codex the actual chronicle finishes with the year 1110, and then a paragraph is added stating, in the first person singular, that the Abbot Sylvester of the Church of St. Michael in Kiev wrote this chronicle (*letopisets*) in the reign of Vladimir in the year 1116. What happened was that Sylvester took the *Povest* as his ground-work, and not merely copied it, but re-edited it, omitting here, altering there. In 1119 an unknown writer again re-edited the whole thing, adding a circumstantial account of the events from 1110 to 1119, principally concerning Vladimir “Monomakh,”

¹ *Ipatyev* is a possessive formed from *Ipatiy*, derived from the Greek ἵπατος.

and including the famous "Instruction to his Children" (*Pouchenie chadom*) of that ruler. This codex is known as the second edition of Sylvester's codex.

The *Povest vremennykh let* acquired this title from the wording of its opening paragraph, which runs:—"These are the tales of bygone years, whence came the Russian land, who in Kiev first began to rule, and whence the Russian land arose." The work itself consists broadly of two parts, of an introductory part without chronological dates, and of the actual chronicle, divided into paragraphs with the date of each year. The introduction is a brief survey of the history of the world since the Flood, with special mention of the descendants of Japhet, one of whom was the ancestor of the Slavs. The chronicle itself begins at the year 852 (6360 according to the old calculation), when, during the reign of the Emperor Michael according to the chronicler, "the Russian land first came to be called by that name" (the word *Russian* is of non-Slavonic origin, and therefore even in the earliest times was a subject of comment and dispute). It goes down to 1113.

The *Povest* itself is a composite work, being a re-edition, very considerably altered, of an earlier historical compilation known conventionally as the "Principal Kiev Compilation" (*Nachalny Kievsky Svod*), together with a continuation of it up to the year 1113. In his task, the editor made extensive use of various non-Russian and Russian sources. The former included the chronicle of George Hamartolus, the Life of Saint Basil the New (a Byzantine work of the Xth century), the Revelation of Saint Methodius of Patras, the so-called "Pannonian Lives," from which he derived his knowledge of the missionaries Cyril and Methodius, and the books of the Holy Scriptures. Russian material utilised by the editor of the *Povest* for the first time included the texts of the treaties concluded between the Russians and the Greeks in the Xth century, a whole series of traditions which he had collected and utilised, dealing with the migration of the Slavs, the customs of the Slavonic tribes, the narration about the Avars (*Obry*), the legend of Saint Andrew, the tradition about *Kiy*, the ferryman who gave his name to *Kiev*, the legend of the death of Oleg (which has its exact counterpart in Norwegian), the account of the fourth act of vengeance of Olga and the capture of Iskorosten (which also has its counterpart in various other literatures), the account of the foundation of the town of Pereyaslavl, and that of the siege of Belgorod by the Pechenegs. Finally, he was able to give his own personal account of the

events between 1093 (the date when the "Principal Kiev Codex" ended) and 1113.

The authorship of the *Povest* was for long attributed to Nestor, who became a monk at the Pechersky Monastery at Kiev about 1074, and was the author of two works: "A Life of Saint Theodosius" (abbot of the famous monastery from 1062-1074), written about 1088, and "Lecture about the Life of (Saints) Boris and Gleb," written about 1082. The reasons for the supposition were that Nestor was mentioned by another author as he "who wrote the chronicle," and that, in one of the copies of the *Povest* (a late one), immediately after the words *Povest vremennykh let* there follow the words "of the Monk Nestor" (*chernoriztsa Nestora*). But when the accounts of the early history of the Monastery and of Boris and Gleb in the Chronicle were compared with those in Nestor's authentic works, such discrepancies became apparent that the theory of identity of authorship had to be abandoned. More recently, too, it has become established that the *Povest* was not a complete work in itself, wholly written by any single author, but a composite work of various origins. It is now not even admitted that Nestor could have been the compiler or editor of the *Povest*; for one thing, the compiler whoever he was, assimilated the strongly Grecophil tendency of the compiler of the "Principal Kiev Compilation," and this was at variance with the more nationalistic spirit which breathes in Nestor's own authentic works.

The "Principal Kiev Compilation," which formed the groundwork of the *Povest*, was composed by an unknown editor, a monk in the Pechersky monastery at Kiev, about 1095. It consists of a preface and epilogue by the editor, with a central chronicle. The preface sets forth the origin of Kiev and of Russia, extolling the virtues of the earlier Russian princes, and implying a contrast between them and the unpopular Prince Svyatopolk II., who was born in 1050, and was ruler of Kiev, the capital city and chief province of Russia in those days, from 1093 to 1113, when he died. The central chronicle is a narration of the chief events of Russian history, beginning with the legendary three brothers Kiy, Shchek and Khoriv, and ending at 1093. The historical groundwork of the "Principal Kiev Compilation," in its turn, was formed by two earlier compilations, the compilation known as that "of the Pechersky Monastery in Kiev," and the "Early Novgorod Compilation." This groundwork was re-edited, and in many places considerably altered and supplemented, by a whole quantity of information

drawn by its editor from other sources. The most important of these were the so-called "chronographic" edition of the *Paleya tolkovaya* or "Explanatory *Paleya*"¹ (from which the editor drew his information on the early attacks against Byzantium by the Russians, and his material for fixing his chronology, which he begins in 854), the *Knyazhesky Pomyannik* or "Princely Necrology" (a work giving information about all the members of the ruling families who had died, compiled in the time of Prince Yaroslav the Wise, who was ruler of Kiev from 1016 to 1054), the *Legend of Korsun*, which told of the conversion of Vladimir during his expedition to the (Taurid) Chersonese in 988 (the editor substituted this Grecophil version of the introduction of Christianity into Russia for the version contained in the earlier "Kievo-Pechersky" compilation,² which made Kiev the scene of this episode), the "Life of the Holy Anthony" (an account of the foundation of the Pechersky monastery at Kiev), the "Instruction about God's punishments" (a version of one of the discourses of St. Chrysostom, one of the most popular and widely-read authors in early Russia), and an extract from the lost "Chronicle of Chernigov," describing an episode of the year 1068. Further, the editor utilised several traditions, of which the most important were the description of the first three acts of vengeance of Olga against the Drevlyane for the murder by them of her husband Igor in 945, the account of Olga's journey to Byzantium, and of her successful duel of words against the Emperor Constantine, son of Leo, and the story of the deception of the Pechenegs, who were threatening Kiev during the absence of Svyatoslav in Bulgaria in 968, by an anonymous youth and the General Pretich. The epilogue contains an eulogy of Prince Vsevolod, who died in 1093, and an account of the first years of his successor Svyatopolk, when a series of exceptional calamities befell Russia. These are described by the editor as the retribution of God on the Russians for their sins, especially the sin of economic insatiability. In making his alterations in, omissions from, and additions to, the texts which formed his groundwork, the editor of the

¹ The *Paleya*, Greek *παλαιά*, was the famous Old Bulgarian translation of the Byzantine work of that name, which was an historical account of Old Testament history, supplemented by the Apocrypha; the "chronographic" edition of this work was a considerably amplified one and included the chronicle of George Hamartolus.

² Cf. p. 76; as a matter of fact, it has never been definitely established where Vladimir himself was actually converted and baptised, cf. Platonov, *Lectures on Russian History*, 9th edition, p. 78 (Petrograd, 1915).

"Principal Kiev Compilation" was actuated by two main motives. In the first place, he was clearly Grecophil and in the second, he was deeply conscious of his duty as a historian to criticise his material, remove all contradictions, explain obscurities, harmonise the chronology of events, eulogise the virtuous and deprecate the vicious rulers of Russia. Since it was this "Principal Kiev Compilation" which was taken by later compilers as their groundwork, the influence of these tendencies displayed by its anonymous editor became extremely far-reaching and played a great part in moulding the opinion of subsequent generations.

The compilation known as that "of the Pechersky monastery in Kiev" (*Kievo-Pechersky svod*), which formed one part of the foundation of the "Principal Kiev Compilation," but has not survived as a separate entity, is supposed to have been composed in 1073 by "the Great" Níkon.¹ This, again, was a composite work, having as its kernel the "Earliest Kiev Compilation," which ended with the year 1039. This was considerably amplified by the new chronicler, and supplemented by his own personal recollections down to the year 1073.

Two of the most important amplifications which have been traced and identified in the earlier portion of the work are the account of the payment of tribute by the *Polyane* (the Slavs of the Kiev district) to the Khazars, which is placed at some unspecified period prior to 852, and the remarkable description of the single combat between Mstislav, brother of Yaroslav the Wise, and the Kasog Prince Rededya, which took place at Tmutorokan, in 1022. It is supposed that this, together with other items of news from this distant Russian outpost in the south-east, was information gleaned by Níkon during his more or less voluntary exile in Tmutorokan.

The most important episodes described in the period between 1039 and 1073 which are attributed to Níkon are the following, which are really complete short narrations in themselves. The "Beginning of the Reign of Izyaslav" under the year 1054, which contains the account of the death of Yaroslav the Wise in that year; the "Beginning of the Pechersky Monastery," founded by Ilaríon, under the year 1062; the remarkable description of the doings of the sorcerers, under the year 1065; the

¹ A prominent light of the monastery. He had to leave it in 1061, owing to differences with the reigning prince Izyaslav, and retired to Tmutorokan, but returned to the monastery in 1068. He was absent again from 1073 to 1074, but in the latter year returned and, from 1078 till his death in 1088, was Abbot.

conflict between the sons of Yaroslav and Vseslav of Polotsk under the year 1067; the revolt in Kiev, and the accession to the throne of Vseslav, under the year 1068; the return of Izyaslav from Poland to Kiev, under the year 1069; the seizure of Kiev and its throne by Svyatoslav of Chernigov in 1073.

The "Kievopechersky Compilation" was continued, for the period from 1073 to 1093—up to 1088, when Níkon died, probably under his supervision; after 1088, by his pupils. It is now thought that one of these latter may have been the famous Nestor.

The other part of the foundation of the "Principal Kiev Compilation" (*cf.* p. 76) was formed by the "Early Nóvgorod Compilation." This is supposed to have been made in 1050, on the occasion of the completion of the new stone church of Saint Sophia, erected in place of an older wooden one which was burnt. The Prince of Nóvgorod at that time was Vladimir, son of Yaroslav the Wise, and the Bishop the famous Luka Zhidyata. It is the latter who is credited with having inspired the composition of this chronicle.

This compilation consists of an account of the events in Russian history from the beginning till the year 1050. The chief sources of information drawn upon by the author were the following: the "Earliest Kiev Compilation" of the year 1039, a copy of which is believed to have been brought to Novgorod by Bishop Luka (this was incorporated almost in its entirety) and the "Novgorod Chronicle of 1036." This latter work consisted of two parts. The first part was composed in 1017 by Joachim, Bishop of Novgorod, at the instigation of the Novgorod authorities, and consisted of a mainly local history of Novgorod from the baptism of its inhabitants in 989 till 1017. Great stress was laid on the events of the years 1014–16, the refusal of Yaroslav, Prince of Novgorod, to pay tribute to his father Vladimir in Kiev, his summoning of hireling Varangians from overseas to support his cause, the death of Vladimir in 1015, the continuance of the conflict between his son and successor Svyatopolk and Yaroslav, the latter's brother, the fight near Lyubech, the defeat of Svyatopolk, the occupation of the throne of Kiev by Yaroslav, and his granting of the famous charter to the men of Novgorod, on which their peculiar status of independence was thenceforth founded. This last was the culminating fact to which the rest of the chronicle led up. The second part was made in 1036. It described the disagreements over matters of jurisdiction which soon arose between Yaroslav

and his former subjects at Novgorod, who, like their late ruler, were already characterised by a spirit of uncompromising independence. These culminated in 1036 by the appointment by Yaroslav of his son Vladimir as ruler in Novgorod, the lessening by no less than nine-tenths of the tribute payable by them to Kiev, and the granting of a new charter, all of which events form the climax of this addition to the local chronicle. The originals of these charters have not survived, and were not copied by composers of the later Moscow compilations, who took their material from the Novgorod compilations.

Other material utilised by the compiler of the "Early Novgorod Compilation" consisted of certain ancient traditions, notably the well-known version of the "first" summoning, in 862, of the Varangians from overseas, at the head of whom were Rurik, Sineus and Truvor (these are the Slavicised forms of the Norse names), "to introduce order among the Slavs and rule over them;" and the account of the petition, in 970, of the men of Novgorod for a prince from Svyatoslav in Kiev; his sending his son Vladimir there with the latter's uncle Dobrynya; the episode in 980 with Rogvolod, the Prince of Polotsk (whose daughter would not marry Vladimir, as his mother had been a slave); the fight against Polotsk; the defeat and slaying of Rogvolod, and the marriage of Vladimir to his daughter Rogneda.

Finally, the events between 1037 and 1050 were described by the compiler in the light of his own experiences and recollections.

The work which formed the kernel both of this "Early Novgorod Compilation" and of the "Kievo-pechersky Compilation" (*cf.* p. 77) is conventionally known as the "Earliest Kiev Compilation." It is supposed to have been composed in 1039, the year of the completion of the Church of Saint Sophia in Kiev, and of the transference of the metropolis of the Russian Church from Pereyaslav, where it had been till then, to Kiev. This was in the reign of Yaroslav the Wise, when the Metropolitan was Theopemptus. It is believed that the custom of keeping a local chronicle of current events in the precincts of the principal church of a given town was introduced into Russia, together with Christianity and many of the other adjuncts of civilisation, from Byzantium, and that this was the origin of this oldest of Russian chronicles. The immediate object of the chronicler was to celebrate the great event of the completion of this church, and to narrate in the form of a prologue the events preceding it.

The compilation sets forth the chief historical happenings in

Russia from the earliest times up to the year 1039, which it does in the form of six distinct relations, each descriptive of a particular period or event. The first is called "The Beginning of the Russian Land," which describes the events from the earliest times up to the death of Igor in 945, and contains the tradition of the foundation of Kiev by the three brothers, the conquest of Kiev by Oleg, the expedition of Oleg against Byzantium, and the story of Igor, Sveneld and Mistisha, which last was considerably toned down in other later compilations, owing to the uncomplimentary light which it threw on the descendants of Rurik. The second is called "The Beginning of the Reign of Svyatoslav," and covers the period from the death of Igor to the beginning of that of Yaropolk in 973, and contains the account of the expedition of Olga, widow of Igor, with her son Svyatoslav, against the *Drevlyane*; the story of the baptism of Olga in 955; the history of Svyatoslav, and the story of his death at the hands of the Pechenegs by the Dnieper rapids in 972. The third is called "The Reign of Yaropolk" (973-978). The fourth is called "The Beginning of the Reign of Vladimir" and contains an account of the events from the expedition of Vladimir from Novgorod against Yaropolk in Kiev in 978 down to Vladimir's death in 1015, the chief episodes or parts being the expedition against Yaropolk which ended in the seizure of the throne of Kiev by Vladimir in 978, the description of the Christian Varangians at Kiev while the Slavs were still pagans, the conversion of Vladimir to Christianity in 987, which, according to this account, took place at Kiev (*cf.* p. 78), the expedition against Korsun, which, according to this account, took place three years later, the description of the almsgiving and the merrymaking of Vladimir and his death. The fifth is called "Of the Killing of Boris," being the account of the murder of his brothers Boris and Gleb by Svyatopolk in 1015, Yaroslav's expedition against Svyatopolk, and the flight of the latter to Poland; this episode is important because it was later elaborated into a *zhitie*, or "life of a saint" (as Boris and Gleb were canonised), and became the model of this class of literary work, so popular in early Russia. The sixth is called "The Beginning of the Reign of Yaroslav in Kiev"; it relates the chief events of his reign up to the year 1039, and ends with an eulogy of Yaroslav.

The whole compilation is a work of considerable complexity. The sources the compiler drew on were of various kinds, and included an unidentified Old Bulgarian Chronicle, which both

served him as a model and provided him with valuable material various Russian works which have not survived, oral traditions, and the author's own recollections of the reign of Yaroslav the Wise, including the detailed description of the battle of Lyubech, and many quite trivial occurrences. Further, no small credit must be given to the author for his original work in harmonising contradictions, explaining obscurities, and drawing analogies.

This earliest chronicle is full of a sense of conviction of the unity of Russia. The author is careful at every opportunity to note the rise and growth of the Russian political state, and to trace its expansion. For this reason, among others, the importance of this work in the history of Russian civilisation can hardly be exaggerated. It not only served as the model and groundwork of all subsequent compilations, but also formed a nursery for the development of the national consciousness of the Russian people.

The method of composition of these chronicles seems at first sight very primitive and clumsy, resembling as it does a kind of patchwork of largely disconnected episodes and stories. The only connecting link between them was the fact that they all dealt with some past events or phases of Russian history which followed on each other in chronological order, and were, after all, not as yet very remote from the recollection of the compiler, or, at any rate, of his seniors. The episodes had, therefore, to be arranged in chronological order; but, as a matter of fact, most of the dates assigned to the earlier episodes and events by the compilers have proved, in the light of modern scientific comparative investigation, to be incorrect, the exceptions being the dates of the treaties between Russia and Byzantium, viz., 907, 912, and 944, which have all been confirmed as correct. In order to fulfil the obligation of which he was conscious, to weld his episodes together into a connected whole, the compiler used to have recourse to the charmingly innocent device of inserting the simplest kinds of links, such as "at the same time," "after these events," "after this;" and whenever he had no information to record under any particular year, he used merely to write "in the year so-and-so [full stop]." The editors of the subsequent compilations used to take the kernel, the "Earliest Kiev Compilation" in the first place, and then, in copying it out, alter, add, or omit according to their particular point of view, or in the light of fresh material which had come to their knowledge. This method of accretion by interpolation seems

extremely simple, and the interpolations are sometimes easy to detect, but at the time it no doubt required a good deal of skill and knowledge to make them.

The attitude of these early chroniclers to their work was very far from objective. They were very free in the expression of their personal likes and dislikes, and of their own opinions and ideas, so that the flavour of their work is often distinctly "tendencious." The general outlook which permeates the chronicles as a whole is naturally coloured by the fact that their authors or editors were men in holy orders of one kind or another. It is true that a good deal of the material of which they were composed was of a lay origin, notably that which dealt with the doings of the *Knyaz* (prince) and his *druzhina* (personal military following) in the earlier pre-Christian, and also in later times, and consequently expressed a more realistic political point of view, with its worship of the lay virtues of personal bravery and cunning. But in all the material which was actually supplied by the monastic authors, and this formed the great bulk, the point of view which predominated was naturally that of Byzantine Christianity. According to this point of view, everything that occurred in human history was a move in the great struggle between the two superhuman agencies which for ever strove for the mastery of mankind and of the world, God and the devil. Every good deed is inspired, every favourable event caused, by the former; all evil by the latter. Hence the frequency of such remarks as "God put a good thought in the Prince of Russia," or again, whenever civil war made its appearance, which it only too frequently did, "the devil raised dissent among the Princes." All the calamities which Russia suffered—famines, plagues, droughts, invasions, and so forth—were sent by God to admonish its erring inhabitants. The devil always inspired men to commit evil deeds against each other, encouraged the infidel invaders and the sorcerers, and rejoiced at the shedding of blood, at all discord, and at internecine strife. Portents of all kinds, such as floods, comets, eclipses, earthquakes, were sent by God to warn mankind of coming events, almost always misfortunes. The whole of human history, in the view of these worthy men, was like a school conducted from on high for the fostering in mankind of virtuous principles and impulses. This intense but narrow outlook was typical of the way in which the Russian mentality absorbed, fully and unquestioningly, all the spirit and the dogmas of Byzantine Christianity.

As civilisation in Russia spread, the custom of keeping local

chronicles grew up in other towns besides Kiev and Novgorod. The basis of these was always formed by one of the older compilations. Later, with the gradual extinction of the local autonomy of the towns, and the rise of Moscow, the local chronicles were transferred to the capital, which was a town of relatively quite recent origin, and were there incorporated in the Moscow Chronicles, which became a sort of continuous official history of the whole of Russia.

NEVILL FORBES.

THE EARLY DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND SERBIA.¹

I.

THE first Serbian revolution against the Turks broke out in 1804. The exasperated peasantry of the Pashalik of Belgrade rose against its tyrants, the Dahis and Janissaries, who exploited and oppressed the people in defiance of existing laws of land tenure and administrative custom. Ere long, however, this conflict assumed a pre-eminently political and national significance. From the very first the leaders of the Revolution showed their intention, and sought the means, not only to rid the country of the Turks but either to break away altogether from the Porte, or form a semi-independent territory which should stand in the same sort of relationship towards the Porte as Wallachia and Moldavia, whose Princes were under the protection of Russia. To this end the insurgents turned to Austria and Russia with appeals for help and encouragement. Austria definitely refused both, but Russia, while declining their proposals, nevertheless held out some hope. In 1806, owing to French machinations—France being at that time at war with Russia—a diplomatic dispute broke out between Russia and Turkey over the privileges of Wallachia and Moldavia. In the end Russia occupied both principalities, whereupon the Porte declared war. Immediately the Serbian Revolution became an event of far-reaching importance. Early in 1807 Russia accepted the Serbians as allies, and the latter broke off direct relations with the Porte, which in the summer of 1806, anticipating war with Russia, had offered them extensive privileges. From that time the Serbians ceased to negotiate directly with the Porte, leaving it to Russia to regulate their

¹ SOURCES: *Public Record Office*, Diplomatic Correspondence (Serbia, Turkey, Russia, Austria).—*Srpska Kralj. Akademija, Spomenik, XVII., Prince Milosh and Col. Hodges* (Letters and extracts of letters sent by Hodges to the Foreign Office 1837–1839), edited by Čeda Mijatović.—Bart. Cunibert, *Srpski Ustanak*, Belgrade, 1901 (original in French): B. S. Cunibert, *Essai historique sur les Révolutions et l'Indépendance de la Serbie depuis 1804 jusqu'en 1850.*—Nil Popov, *Srbija i Rusija*, Vol. I. (trans. from Russian), Belgrade, 1870.

position with regard to Turkey. Obviously, therefore, the fate of the Serbian insurgents became a matter to be decided at the end of the war by treaty between Russia and Turkey, since Russia had assumed the obligation to look after their interests. Various unfortunate political circumstances compelled the Serbians to apply to Austria and France; but these dealings were merely in the nature of political feelers, which in no way affected Russo-Serbian relations.

When peace negotiations were opened in 1809, it was Russia's intention to demand the Danube as frontier between her and Turkey-in-Europe as far as the Iron Gates, and autonomy for Serbia under the protection of the Tsar and the sovereignty of the Sultan; this bond between Serbia and the Porte to be signalled only by the payment of a very moderate tribute. Complete independence for the Serbians was no part of Russia's programme at the time, although she had formally promised them as much. In the opinion of Russian statesmen, an independent Serbia, wedged between Turkey, Austria and Russia, with France (who was holding Dalmatia) as a near neighbour, would be a constant menace to peace between these empires. The Serbians would naturally work for union with their brothers under Turkish, Austrian and French rule; each of her neighbours, according to circumstances, would endeavour either to subjugate Serbia or to foster and establish a preponderant influence there; and Russia, in her efforts to maintain her own influence and to defend the independence of Serbia, would reap nothing but trouble from such a state of affairs.

The Porte fully grasped the importance of the Russian demands, and fought with the utmost tenacity both in the field and at the council table. When finally, towards the end of 1810, the possibility of a war between Russia and France began to loom on the political horizon, the Porte, despite all the defeats it suffered in 1811, was more unyielding than ever. Russia, on the other hand, faced by the danger of attack by Napoleon, was compelled to try to come to terms with the Porte and to moderate her demands, solely in order that France might have one ally the less. Negotiations began at Giurgiu in October, 1811, but were broken off in December after fourteen meetings, the last of which took place at Bucarest. The Porte considered it exorbitant of Russia to demand that the Russo-Turkish frontier in Europe should be formed by the rivers Seret and Danube, nor would it recognise Russia's conquests in Asia.

In April, 1812, negotiations were reopened at Bucarest.

Russia had to conclude peace at all costs, as Napoleon was nearing her frontier with an immense army, which was swelled by the forces of his vassals. This host was to be supported by the armies of Austria and Prussia, with whom France had concluded alliances. In the end the Porte was likewise obliged to adopt a more reasonable attitude on the peace question, in spite of much French and Austrian intrigue.

The Treaty between the Porte and Russia was signed at Bucarest in May, 1812, and by it was decided the fate of the first Serbian Revolution, which by force of circumstances had become bound up with the issue of the conflict between Russia and Turkey. This fact—that the outcome of the Revolution under Kara George was dealt with by a treaty between Russia and Turkey—was fraught with important consequences for the Serbian people.

The Serbian question is dealt with in Article VIII.¹ of the Treaty of Bucarest. By it the Porte was entitled to re-occupy all fortified places in Serbia and to furnish them with garrisons, artillery and munitions at its discretion. On the other hand, the Porte undertook to grant the Serbians full pardon for the past; to guarantee that the Turkish garrisons stationed in Serbia should not endanger public security by arbitrarily maltreating the population; to grant to Serbians the same privileges as were enjoyed by Ottoman subjects in the Islands of the Archipelago and other privileged territories of the Empire; not to interfere in Serbian internal affairs, and only to impose a moderate tribute upon the Serbians, to be collected and paid by them to the Porte. Finally, in regard to all these points, the Porte was to negotiate with the Serbians direct.

This last stipulation is of special importance. Whereas the whole of Article VIII. leaves it to be inferred that, whatever the Porte concedes, it concedes out of generosity, of its own accord, and in response to Serbian petitions, this last provision deprives the Porte of the right of *imposing* its own solutions, and directs it

¹ This article runs as follows:—"That their present Prince Miloš Obrenović, in recompense for his fidelity towards my Sublime Porte, and in accordance with the Berat which he possesses, will continue to be the Prince of the Serbian Nation, and this dignity will be hereditary in his family; he will continue in the name of my Sublime Porte to administer the internal affairs of the country and to settle them in concert with the Council and Assembly of the Chiefs and Elders of the Nation As long as the Chiefs and Elders, members of the Council, of which mention has been made before, do not render themselves guilty of any grave offence towards my Sublime Porte or towards the laws and the constitution of the country they shall not be dismissed, nor shall they be deprived of their offices without cause or without having committed some offence."

to enter into negotiations with its subjects and to come to terms with them. In its essence this article embodies a compromise between the legal position of Serbia and the position created by the Revolution. The state of affairs produced in Serbia by the first Revolution had in itself no legal basis. Prior to the Treaty of Bucarest Serbia was an Ottoman province in a state of rebellion. By this treaty, and despite all respect for the sovereign rights of the Sultan, Serbia was detached from the Ottoman Empire and became a territory with special privileges, a political entity; and the former *rayah* (slaves) within her borders became citizens endowed with rights. Even though Serbia was not placed under Russian protection, yet by the whole tenor of the treaty the Porte was henceforth accountable to Russia for the faithful fulfilment of the obligations incurred by her under its terms.

But whatever was the measure of these results, considering the political conditions under which the treaty was concluded, its value for the Serbs of that time must not be gauged from the purely historical standpoint—namely the question of how it affected the historic right of the Sultan over the province. Its real value lay not in the legal and judicial status which it conferred upon Serbia, but in the hope and expectancy which it aroused in the nation that the treaty would legalise the position created by the Revolution.

In point of fact the Treaty of Bucarest abrogates the state of affairs created by the Revolution. Not even under the most auspicious circumstances could it have safeguarded what had been founded under Kara George, or guaranteed the nation's retention of the gains it had in its hands at the time. The Serbians considered themselves practically free; and to permit the Turks now to re-enter the country, to hand over to them all its fortresses, the bulwarks of national freedom and security, meant for the insurgents that they would be left at the mercy of the Turks; and that the latter would prove merciful, after all the defeats and humiliations inflicted upon them, was out of the question. Finally, the actual manner in which this compromise was to be worked out, was not made sufficiently clear to the two parties; only the preliminaries of the subsequent agreements had been settled. Under these conditions, with nothing worked out in detail and everything to be discussed between two unequally matched opponents, the thing that really mattered was: what guarantee was there that the Porte would act loyally, and not abuse the rights conferred upon it by the Treaty of

Bucarest? For the moment there was no such guarantee. Russia, who had the right and the duty to see to this, and if necessary to act as mediator in order to bring about an agreement, was fully occupied with her own troubles. She was involved in a life and death struggle with Napoleon, and quite unable to exercise any pressure whatever upon the Porte, which had never failed to draw the utmost advantage from situations of this kind. It now insisted upon unconditional surrender from the Serbians, and refused to accord them even the little that had been guaranteed at Bucarest. The Serbians, being already profoundly dissatisfied with the treaty, this naturally resulted in a fresh conflict.

Having got rid of the Russians, the Porte attacked Serbia from all sides in August, 1813. At the end of October, Serbia was conquered and the authority of the Sultan completely re-imposed without the slightest regard for the Treaty of Bucarest. The *régime* which followed the conquest was so unjust and oppressive that in April, 1815, the Serbians revolted again. At the head of the insurgents this time was Miloš Obrenović. The Turks who constituted the garrison in Serbia, or who lived there simply as inhabitants, after having been defeated in several engagements, either shut themselves up in the fortresses or quitted the country. The Porte became very alarmed at this reopening of the Serbian question. In September, two Turkish armies arrived on the Serbian frontier. The one, coming from Bulgaria, was commanded by Marashly Ali Pasha; the other, from Bosnia, was under the orders of Kurshid Pasha, the ex-Grand Vizier, who had conquered Serbia in 1813. The insurgents found themselves in an extremely precarious situation. Salvation, however, came from Russia, which had its hands free once more, Napoleon having just been defeated for the second time. Acting under instructions sent from Paris by the Tsar Alexander, the Russian Ambassador at Constantinople handed to the Porte on 30 September a Note, in which he reminded the latter of its acts against Serbia and of its obligations to her on the basis of Article VIII. of the Treaty of Bucarest, and demanded its application in such a manner as would dispense Russia from the necessity of raising the whole issue.

The Porte understood the full significance of the Russian note; it understood also that the political situation was very unfavourable, and therefore issued an immediate order to the two commandants who had been sent to conquer Serbia, to pacify her in an amicable manner. Towards the middle of

October a verbal arrangement was made between Miloš and Ali Pasha, by which the right of organising a feeble national administration was ceded to the Serbians.

This concession was very precarious, but it eventually became more and more important. The favourable development arose on the one hand from the fact of the pressure exercised on the Porte by Russia, and on the other hand from the diplomacy of Miloš, who knew how to exploit the situation created in Serbia as a consequence of this pressure. Indeed the Russian Ambassador at Constantinople in November, 1816, had begun to ask the Porte why it had not carried out certain articles of the Treaty of Bucarest, especially Article VIII. The Porte always invoked the arrangement made between Miloš and Ali Pasha as being equivalent to the provisions of the article concerning Serbia; but the ambassador, on the contrary, demanded that the Sultan should give Serbia a Hattisheriff, in which should be recorded all the privileges of a complete administrative autonomy which were due to Serbia by virtue of the above-mentioned article. The negotiations between the Porte and Russia underwent many vicissitudes, and it was only by the Convention of Akkerman (Oct. 1826) that the Treaty of Bucarest was revised in detail.

By Article V. of the Convention, the Porte bound itself to discuss and arrange with the Serbian deputies, within eighteen months at the utmost, the privileges conferred by Article VIII. of that Treaty. The privileges admitted in principle, which were to serve as a basis for these discussions and to form part of the Hattisheriff for Serbia, were recorded in a *Separate Act*. These privileges were: religious liberty; the right of the Serbians to choose their own rulers or princes; independence of the internal administration in Serbia; the consolidation of the various taxes into one; the cession to the Serbians of the administration of Mussulman property (on condition of paying over to the Porte, simultaneously with the tribute, the rents due to the dispossessed Spahis); the establishment of hospitals, schools and printing offices, and a prohibition against Mussulmans, except those belonging to the garrison, settling in Serbia. Further, the Porte was to surrender the six districts which belonged to Serbia at the conclusion of the Bucarest Treaty, and which did not take part in the rising of 1815 under Miloš Obrenović. The Convention of Akkerman solemnly guaranteed to Russia the right to protect Serbian privileges.

While signing this Convention, the Porte by no means intended to carry it out. It was merely a means of gaining time.

In April, 1828, Russia declared war on the Porte, which was concluded by the Treaty of Adrianople in September, 1829. By this treaty everything which had been guaranteed to Serbia at Akkerman was confirmed.

During this long and difficult period of Russo-Turkish relations, Miloš remained in close touch with Russia, though in such a way as to avoid offending the Porte. From 1815 to 1830 he had not ceased to beg the Porte to grant certain privileges to Serbia without however invoking the Treaty of Bucarest. The quoting of this treaty he left to Russia. The affair was too big for him to grapple with, but he profited during the diplomatic and military struggle between Russia and the Porte, by emancipating the national administration from the authority of the Pasha of Belgrade, and by representing himself to the people, to the Porte and to Russia as the only possible prince for the new embryonic State. This doubly ambitious task he pursued successfully and without scruples. By means of bribery he won over successive Pashas at Belgrade—the more so as they had orders from Constantinople to avoid arousing discontent among the Serbians in order not to provoke Russia; and meanwhile he rid himself by assassination of his most dangerous opponents, and imposed himself on the people. By 1830 this leader of the Serbian insurgents of 1815 was *de facto* ruler and absolute master of Serbia. Legal confirmation alone was wanting.

In 1830 all the Serbian privileges which Russia had guaranteed by the Convention of Akkerman had been discussed in detail at the conferences between the Russian Ambassador and the Porte, and the result of these discussions was recorded in a "Hattisheriff," or charter, which laid the foundations of Serbia as a semi-independent principality. During these negotiations Miloš by bribes and persuasion succeeded in obtaining from the Sultan a provision that the title of Prince should be hereditary in his family. According to the Convention of Akkerman, Serbia had no right to the hereditary princely dignity, the elective principle having been admitted. Russia let the Porte do what it thought best, and the Sultan eventually granted to Miloš by a special "*berat*" or diploma the dignity of an hereditary prince.

In December, 1830, the hattisheriff and the berat were proclaimed with great solemnity at Belgrade. The former was not applied without great detriment to Serbia. The Porte was reluctant to cede the six districts until, in 1832-3, profiting

by the derangement and confusion caused at Constantinople by the Egyptian successes of Mehemet Ali, Miloš first of all promoted disorders in the coveted districts, and then occupied them under the pretext of restoring order. The Porte then recognised the *fait accompli*. There was no doubt about Serbia's right to these regions, and in any case Russia was at this moment all-powerful at Constantinople. At the same time, however, Serbia suffered a set-back in another matter of the greatest importance. The Hattisheriff of 1830 said: "No Turks except those who garrison the fortresses shall be allowed to inhabit Serbia." In other words, the Turks living in the suburbs of the fortresses had either to leave the country, or to withdraw into the fortresses and form part of the garrison. In spite of the protests of Miloš and the Russian Ambassador, the Porte delayed the evacuation of the suburbs until 1833, when Russia, by the Treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi, became more the protectress than the ally of Turkey. When the Porte accepted the occupation of the six districts by the Serbs, it appealed to Russia to grant concessions in the question of the evacuation of the fortress suburbs by the Turks. Thanks to the conservative policy of the Russian Court with regard to Turkey, which was inaugurated by the above-mentioned treaty, Tsar Nicholas yielded to the urgent request of the Sultan, allowed the Turks to remain in the city of Belgrade, and granted the Porte a delay of five years as regards other places. Following upon these decisions, the Sultan issued in 1833 what is known in Serbian history as the "Supplementary Hattisheriff."

Thus the limits of Serbia were definitely set. The tribute was fixed at 2,300,000 Turkish piastres, in which total were included all the dues paid by Serbia to the Porte under any heading whatsoever. Of this amount, one million piastres were earmarked for the revenue of the military fiefs (timars, ziamets) and the Sultan's estates (moukatas), and the Porte had to reimburse the individuals out of this total; these fiefs, which the Spahis held from the Sultan for their military service, became definitely the property of the Serbian peasant. As a further result of the Hattisheriff of 1830, the Church of Serbia was freed from the control of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.

II.

The position of Serbia in relation to the Porte having thus been settled, the next item on the order of the day was the internal organisation of the country.

Prince Miloš, by his general and political education, had but little sense of the importance of constitutional law, and by temperament he was an autocrat. The whole authority was concentrated in his hands, and in the internal affairs of the country he was absolute master. He was not only the ruler of the country, but also its foremost business man, financier and farmer. He used his power in the first place to protect his own material interests, and his absolutism frequently developed into tyranny and Oriental despotism.

Up to the year 1830, when the position of Serbia towards Turkey was definitely settled, the Chiefs and the mass of the people tolerated the many abuses of authority by Prince Miloš, from the mere apprehension that things might take a worse turn. The latter, therefore, up to 1830, could always reckon upon the allegiance of the principal Chiefs, and the various rebellions against his tyranny always ended in a fiasco. But since the Hattisheriff of 1830 the Chiefs and the people expected that Prince Miloš would grant some fundamental constitutional law to the country. Moreover, it was in the nature of things that such laws should be granted, because in no country can any order be imagined without some such laws, and the Hattisheriff enjoined this course upon Prince Miloš. The Porte was not interested in this question, nor did it understand its importance for Turkey. Russia evinced a certain interest in the internal organisation of Serbia, but did not regard the question as in any way urgent. She left to Prince Miloš and to the people the settlement of the problem in conformity with the Hattisheriff of 1830, in which, however (not without strong opposition on the part of Miloš), she had incorporated a very important clause requiring the Prince to govern in agreement with a Council or Senate, composed of the most prominent men of the country, to be appointed for life.

Prince Miloš delayed from year to year the granting of the Constitution. Yet the need for such a step had never been so acutely felt as after the Hattisheriff of 1830, which represented not only an important political act, but also an act by which the greatest economic change in modern Serbia was accomplished. This change also required legal protection.

Owing to Prince Miloš's procrastination and Russia's indifference, the principal Chiefs of the people started a rebellion against Prince Miloš in January, 1835; and this, though it ended without bloodshed, made Miloš realise that the constitutional question would not brook further delay. On February 14

the National Assembly unanimously voted a Constitution, and this was drafted by the Prince's Secretary, Dimitrije Davidović.

This Constitution had but a short life; Austria was very much alarmed by it, and it was not very pleasing to Russia, especially on account of the methods by which it was obtained. It was cancelled thanks to the joint action of Russia and the Porte, which claimed the right of direct intervention in this question, and much to the secret satisfaction of Miloš, who had only granted it under compulsion.

Under the influence of the rebellion of 1835, and in order to check Miloš's arbitrary tendencies, Russia insisted that he should grant organic laws: but the name constitution, so odious to Metternich, was carefully avoided and all such phrases and definitions as might seem to lay stress on the political individuality of Serbia were also omitted (such, for instance, as succession to the throne, coat-of-arms, flag, national assembly, etc.) Stress had to be laid rather on the administrative than on the political side of the pact.

In 1836 a draft scheme was sent from St. Petersburg to the Prince, its main proposal being the institution of a senate or council of the most representative chiefs, with lifelong tenure of office. These same chiefs, however, were practically all hostile to Prince Miloš. There had been a similar provision in the Constitution of 1835, but at that time it had appeared to Prince Miloš to be less dangerous, since the document was his own work and the nominations were in his own hands. Besides, according to that Constitution, the National Assembly played a certain *rôle*, and consequently the Prince had more chance for his manoeuvres. Moreover, since the cancellation of the Constitution of 1835, he had undergone an important psychological change which made him less amenable to the demands of Russia. The visit which Miloš paid to the Sultan in the summer of 1835 and his prolonged stay at Constantinople had a strong influence on his vanity. His innate disposition to intrigue found a strong stimulus and encouragement in the Turkish capital, where for the first time he saw the ministers and ambassadors of several Great Powers working for predominance in Turkey; and this aroused in him the desire to play a more important *rôle* and rise above the narrow limits of Russo-Turkish relations. This tendency was soon perceived by Russia. "I fear," said Miloš in later years, "Russia has been my enemy ever since my visit to Constantinople." Looking back, Miloš felt far greater bitterness now against certain Russian acts than he had experienced at the time of their actual

occurrence—as, for instance, in the episode of the haughty behaviour towards him of Baron Ruckmann, the Russian Consul-general for Wallachia and Moldavia, when he visited Serbia in the summer of 1835 to enquire into the matter of the new Constitution. Ruckmann spoke sarcastically of the constitutional regulations, of the Serbian coat-of-arms and flag, and of the Obrenović succession : and Miloš drew the conclusion that Russia had no regard either for him or for Serbia. He became convinced that she was opposed to him, or at least that she was working to restrain his authority, and he leant more and more to the view that Russia looked upon Serbia as a mere instrument in her future designs against the Ottoman Empire. Under these new conditions Miloš came to regard the Council elected for life as a dangerous institution and therefore tried to ignore the Russian demand.

The conditions under which the Constitution of 1835 was introduced had definitely compromised the Chiefs of the country in the eyes of Miloš, for he could clearly see what they thought of him, and he heard of all that they discussed at their secret meetings. He was informed that some of them suggested his abdication or even his assassination, if he should not agree to grant the Constitution. In any case Miloš knew for certain that after the eagerness with which he had cancelled the Constitution, he could not reckon on the fidelity and devotion of the more energetic Chiefs, who indeed distrusted him. In fact the position remained as it was on the eve of the rebellion of 1835, with the additional dilemma that either Miloš or the Chiefs would have to capitulate. The Council elected for life became the main party issue, and both parties speculated with great anxiety as to the attitude of the mass of the people in the event of an open conflict.

Meanwhile the people passively endured the *régime* of Miloš but it became more and more evident that they were gradually being affected by the secret propaganda against the Prince, who had moreover the reputation of breaking faith. They knew that he stood pledged to constitutional government, but they knew nothing of the international policy that had delayed a fulfillment of the pledge.

The leader of the dissatisfied element was Jevrem Obrenović, the Prince's brother, but the soul of the conspiracy was Thomas Vučić. Two of their colleagues, Stojan Simić and George Protić, owing to their fear of Miloš, thought it wiser to quit the country. In this way the anti-Miloš party obtained two strong exponents abroad, with whom Vučić had constant secret connections.

Simić settled down at Bucarest, and Protić wandered about in Austria, Wallachia and Turkey. Both of them worked zealously upon Russia, representing the *régime* of Prince Miloš in the blackest colours and asking for Russian intervention. Protić was active in Turkey also, describing Miloš as the Porte's greatest enemy; nor was this a difficult task, since the Turks already held this opinion and were, quite apart from any such propaganda, the bitterest enemies of the Prince. Yussuf Pasha, Commander of the Belgrade fortress, greatly sympathised with Miloš's opponents.

Under the influence of the struggle for the Constitution in Serbia and the allegations against Prince Miloš, Russia, in 1836, appointed a Vice-Consul at Orsova on the Danube, with instructions to watch developments in Serbia and to inform the Government of all that might be of interest.

No Consul was sent to Belgrade itself, as this would have created the impression that Russia wished to control Miloš and to support the opposition against him. Russia avoided this, however, on account of the Porte and on account of other countries interested in the Porte, and especially Britain and France, both of whom, if Russia had appointed consuls in Serbia, would probably have followed her example and appointed special agents to watch her activities in the new principality. Austria, it is true, appointed a Consul at Belgrade in 1836, but her position was considered exceptional, owing to her proximity to Serbia and the close economic relations which this involved.

None the less, Miloš saw the centre of the plot against himself in the person of the Russian Vice-consul at Orsova, through whom he thought Russia smuggled money into Serbia and intrigued for his overthrow and the succession of a member of Kara George's family; he was convinced that he had lost the Tsar's favour through the machinations of Rodofinikin, who had been Russian agent in Serbia during the first insurrection, and now occupied a very high position in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in St. Petersburg.¹

Miloš was almost isolated and could not even rely on his *entourage*. Being illiterate, he employed Hungarian Serbs as confidential secretaries and interpreters. It was in these circumstances that Colonel George Lloyd Hodges went to Belgrade as first British Consul.

¹ Rodofinikin died in June, 1838. At that time he was entrusted with the direction of the Foreign Department in the absence of Count Nesselrode, who had left Petersburg to join the Emperor in Germany.

III.

By the defensive and offensive treaty of alliance, concluded between Russia and Turkey at Unkiar-Skelessi in 1833, Russia obtained a kind of protectorate over the Ottoman Empire. The exceptional position of Russia on the Bosphorus was a nightmare to the European Powers interested, and especially to Great Britain. Lord Palmerston eagerly studied measures for preserving Turkey's integrity and submitting the stipulations of Unkiar-Skelessi to international consideration. As part of his struggle against Russia's preponderating influence at the Porte, Lord Palmerston thought it useful to send an agent to Serbia, who would keep an eye on Russia's activities among the liberated Balkan Slavs.

Hodges, in addition to his ordinary consular duties, received definite political instructions (dated 23 February, 1837) telling him, among other things, to watch "very closely any attempts which the Russian Consul may make to increase the political influence of his Government either in Serbia or in adjoining countries." In the case of any dispute arising between the Prince and the Russian Consul, Hodges had carefully to avoid committing the British Government. If the Prince should appeal to him, he had to confine himself to a statement that his safest course was "frankly and unhesitatingly to comply with any demands which the Russian Consul is by the treaty entitled to make, and firmly but temperately to resist any attempt to extort . . . concessions of which the treaties do not authorise the demand." He was to bear constantly in mind that the British Government was deeply interested in the maintenance, prosperity and consolidation of Turkey, and consequently to discourage to the utmost any action on the part either of Prince Miloš or of any other persons, which might tend against this policy. In conclusion, Hodges was warned that these special political instructions were given to him owing to the peculiar circumstances prevailing in Serbia, and that it was desirable that he should confine himself strictly to his consular duties and avoid "all discussions on political matters, especially when such discussion is merely speculative." In addition some political instructions were given to Colonel Hodges verbally, but we do not know their precise wording.

Hodges took possession of the Consulate of Belgrade on 29 May, 1837. At this period Belgrade was a town of 13,000 inhabitants, including 2,700 Turks and several hundred Jews;

the garrison of the fortress amounted to some 2,000 more. The authority of the Sultan in Serbia was represented by Yussuf Pasha, who resided in the citadel of Belgrade. At the head of the Serbian administration at Belgrade was Jevrem Obrenović, the brother of Prince Miloš.

Hodges was received by the Serbians with great courtesy and every mark of respect. When, however, he presented himself to the Pasha commanding the fortress, the latter received him seated on a divan. Hodges regarded this as an insult and left him ceremoniously but very hastily, and their relations never improved. Yussuf Pasha had Russophile leanings, and was looked upon by many people as a traitor to his master for having surrendered Varna to the Russians in 1829. It was said that on this account he was permanently on the list of the Tsar's pensioners.

On 5 June Hodges was received by Prince Miloš in his capital Kragujevac, two days' journey from Belgrade. Apart from the usual compliments, Miloš particularly expressed his satisfaction at seeing a consul appointed by Great Britain in Serbia. In response to the prince's asseverations that he wished to be in regular friendly touch with him, Hodges suggested taking up his residence in Kragujevac : but Miloš refused with great loquacity, pointing out that Belgrade was the second capital, where he made prolonged stays. On his return to Belgrade Hodges set himself to study the political situation in the country, and in his first report to Lord Palmerston, dated 23 June, gave the result of his observations. He takes up a purely objective standpoint, and describes without extenuation the *régime* of Miloš. According to his information, a strong feeling of discontent prevailed throughout all classes against Prince Miloš, arising in a great degree from his resistance to the granting of any law for securing the safety of persons and property and the freedom of commerce. Should the Prince postpone much longer the establishment of a legal system of government, a revolution which might overturn Miloš and his dynasty and lead to Russian intervention, was inevitable. All this had been related to Hodges "by enlightened and influential people," who had asked him to make representations to the Prince : but he politely refused to interfere in the internal affairs of Serbia, or even to speak of the subject, unless called upon to do so by the Prince.

The first impression Hodges received from these conversations was that Russia was exciting a feeling of discontent against the Prince, but he recognised that the despotic acts of the latter

were in themselves sufficient to arouse popular distrust. In any case Hodges accepted the opinion of many others that a revolution, which might have far-reaching consequences, would soon break out. Subsequently Hodges gave a very precise description of the internal *régime* in Serbia and of the people's grievances, which latter formed the principal instrument of Russian agents:—"No constitution exists in this country nor even any description of established laws, civil or criminal; the country is governed by the absolute will of the Prince; no contract is binding except by his power; no marriage can take place without his approval; no transfer of property can be effected except by his sanction, and no will of a deceased person is valid without the Prince's examination and approval. Again, criminals are tried by him and punishment awarded according to his decision, which in some instances is extremely rigorous . . ." The most irksome duty imposed on the people was the "kuluk," or compulsory labour for public and private work. "The peasantry are forced to leave their own agricultural pursuits, and often at several days' distance from their home are assembled to work for the Prince, whose estates are cultivated in this manner: no sort of recompense . . . nor even any food or refreshment."

Some weeks after the audience at Kragujevac, Prince Miloš arrived in Belgrade, and on the evening of 12 July, Hodges was received by him in an audience of several hours' duration. At first conversation was difficult. The Prince had been persuaded that he must be on his guard against English duplicity, but Hodges soon succeeded in breaking the ice, and the interview became very prolonged, and very confidential on the part of Miloš. Hodges emphasised the fact that he was appointed consul to *him*, the legitimate Prince of Serbia, and not—as was the case with the Austrian Consul—to the Turkish authorities. This was sufficient to prove the importance Great Britain attached to his person and his country. Miloš then spoke of the internal state of Serbia and her relations with foreign Powers, and Hodges received the impression that the Prince was fully conscious that his position was critical. "Probably," said the Prince, "within two months I may have to call for the intervention of foreign Powers. I wish to live in peace and goodwill with all; I have been faithful to Turkey and I have a debt of gratitude to the Sultan that I fear I can never repay; I believe him to be my friend, and under such circumstances I am induced to hope that England and her allies will see justice done to me as a vassal of the Porte and save Serbia from foreign aggression, as also to maintain the spirit of

the Hattisheriff which insures to her her independence." Hodges gave assurances in accordance with his instructions, but without committing the British Government any further.

Through fear of his enemies, who kept a watchful eye on all his relations with the British Consul, Miloš continued his political conversations with the latter through the medium of his own physician; Dr. Cunibert, who had acted as interpreter at the first confidential interview. Dr. Cunibert, a Piedmontese by birth, had been living in Serbia for the last 15 years. He was poor, possessed a large family and was very attached to the Prince who was the godfather of his children, this being, among the Serbians, equivalent to a kind of relationship. Though a supporter of Miloš, he was a Liberal in the Western sense. Equally Russophobe and Austrophobe, without family connections with the country or with the parties, he was the very man for the post of confidant and intermediary between the Prince and the Consul, who still continued to see each other, though not very often. If Cunibert did not like playing the part which was allotted to him, he at least had the satisfaction of being employed in a political matter whose goal was a *rapprochement* between Serbia and the Western Powers, and her emancipation from Russian influence. He was one of the first to put before the British Consul the problems agitating Serbia, problems of which he had a thorough knowledge. Hodges found him a most valuable source for all kinds of information, and paid him a very moderate sum for his services.

In his many interviews with the Prince and Cunibert, or with the latter alone, Hodges noted the Prince's fears of internal discontent, and his conviction that it was all aroused and increased by Russian agents, in close contact with the Russian consul at Orsova. The cabal was highly developed, and the Prince mistrusted everyone about him, even the members of his own family : indeed he might be said to suffer from persecution mania, so great was his mental agitation. " He even told me that he could not depend upon his wife . . . The Princess may have some latent design to invest his eldest son, Milan, with the sovereignty . . . The Prince Milan, who is twenty years of age, is little better than an idiot, and incapable of connecting the simplest of ideas, possessed of a morose and sullen disposition, and moreover, like his mother, entirely devoted to Russia."

In these conversations the Prince touched upon the actual manner in which he would proceed : he would appeal to the country, submit to its representatives the state of Serbian foreign

policy, define his personal position and announce his determination of appealing to Britain, France and Austria to take under their protection his and Serbia's independence, as defined and guaranteed by the treaties with the Porte. He was ready to execute a dramatic stroke : if the assembly thought it necessary he would abdicate. Re-affirming his attachment to the Porte, Miloš asked Hodges whether Britain would support him in the event of oppression by Russia. Hodges replied that she would resist every encroachment of Russia or of any other foreign State upon Serbia or upon any part of the Ottoman dominions. But at the same time he suggested that in such peculiar circumstances it was the Prince's plain duty to take immediate steps to guarantee the security of persons and property, and adopt such other measures as would expedite the ends of justice and restore to him the affection and confidence of the people. It was the only means of keeping Russian propaganda in check. Hodges could not induce the Prince to make any positive answer; in this respect he was dilatory, and promised "to speak again" on the subject. This incapacity to declare his policy and to undertake decisive measures, Hodges attributed to the mental agitation of the Prince, which was provoked by the constant intrigues around him.

The intention of Russia, Hodges wrote to Palmerston, was to impose on Miloš—whom she distrusted and with whom she was dissatisfied—a Senate or Council of her own agents, in order to secure for herself ascendancy in Serbia. In his opinion this would be fatal to Turkey, and he thought it was his duty to resist all such measures by every means and on every occasion. In other words, the problem which faced the British Government, if it would not permit Russia to lay hands on Serbia, was to oppose with energy her plan of surrounding Miloš with a Senate composed of life-members. "The individuals thus attempted to be forced into the councils of the Prince Miloš are as despotic in their principles and as tyrannic in their dispositions as the Prince himself can possibly be." In the circumstances in which the Serbian people and the Ottoman Empire were situated it was, in Hodges's opinion, preferable to vest the power solely in the hands of the Prince, though he realised the objections to such a course. "The vacillating character of the Prince increases the difficulties, and his natural cunning and want of principle lead me to be apprehensive of his political honesty, and, therefore, of the difficulties I may have to encounter in effecting with him as much as could be desired. I am not without hope of being able to convince the

Prince that England has the power and inclination to prove as useful to him as Russia or any other State . . . He is most eager to cherish the friendship and goodwill of the British Government. I can clearly perceive that he is fearful of acting in accordance with the views of Great Britain, or of adopting any decided measure which might at once bring down upon him the powerful and dangerous enmity of Russia."

These interviews had made a good impression on Miloš. The prospect of British protection was a veritable godsend to him; she was powerful enough to stand up to Russia, but he found it difficult to understand in what way this power could be useful to him and to Serbia, as she was so far away and without direct communications. Miloš could not forget the answer given by a high British official during the Congress of Vienna to some Serbian deputies, who requested British intervention on behalf of their countrymen. When they alluded to the terrible reprisals which followed the Turkish conquest in 1813, they were reminded that "England was too distant to render succour to Serbia." Dr. Cunibert was particularly instructed to discuss this question with Hodges, and he submitted to the Prince the following answer: Great Britain was capable of protecting Serbia, its privileges, and its Prince by diplomatic methods only; the material resources which Great Britain had at her command lent to all her diplomatic actions tremendous weight in international questions and in all countries, even those which were more distant and with which communication was more difficult than was the case with Serbia. As a condition of this protection Great Britain only demanded that Prince Miloš should faithfully fulfil his obligations as a vassal of the Porte, which for its part would respect the concessions made to Serbia.

For several months longer Miloš continued these confidential relations with Hodges, who finally succeeded in dispelling the Prince's distrust. He had also won over the Foreign Office for his ideas; and the British Ambassadors in Vienna and Constantinople were instructed to work in accordance with this scheme. Sir Frederick Lamb had to allay Austrian suspicions with regard to British action in favour of Miloš. Hodges remained the real moving spirit in the affair, and this became especially apparent after Tsar Nicholas despatched Prince Dolgoruky to Serbia. Indeed the latter's mission was mainly due to the ascendancy acquired by Hodges over the Prince. The Tsar instructed Dolgoruky to request the Prince to grant an admini-

strative *réglement*, and he thus hoped to end the struggle between Prince and chiefs and indirectly also British interference in Serbian affairs. Miloš pretended to listen to the Russian advice in order to give Hodges the necessary time to explain the position to London, Vienna and Constantinople. To the Foreign Office Hodges's argument ran as follows: "If Miloš is not supported against the faction of the Chiefs, Russia will lay her hands on Serbia. Her influence once established here, then Bosnia, Bulgaria, and other provinces of the Turkish Empire would be at her mercy; she would only have to order a general rising of the Christians, in order to settle once for all with the Ottoman Empire. Miloš was Russia's rival in influence over the Christians in Turkey, and his prestige among them was very high, and consequently the interest of all the Powers which were in opposition to Russia and in favour of the integrity of the Ottoman Empire was to support Miloš, and prevent Russian influence from establishing itself at Belgrade, either directly, or indirectly by the institution of a Senate. The Porte had to attach him to itself by every possible means. Miloš's fidelity to the Porte would be very precious to Turkey, as it would give her much of the security which would be lacking if Miloš's enemies assumed the power. It would also help to weaken the influence of Russia in Bulgaria and Roumelia. Alone, however, Miloš could do nothing. "His nation has a deep-rooted prejudice of the omnipotence of Russia." He had not "a firm alliance with other foreign States which would enable him to show indifference, or disregard to the overtures of Russia." Such an act on his part might, under prevailing circumstances, be fatal to him.

On 14 December Hodges wrote to Palmerston that the final moment had arrived for giving Miloš a proof of the moral power of Great Britain. The best proof of this power would be to compel the Porte to fulfil to the letter the stipulation of the Hattisheriff of 1830 concerning the city of Belgrade, namely, that the Turks should evacuate it. Russia did not insist on this positive right of Serbia in order to satisfy Turkey after the Treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi. On 17 January, 1838, Hodges went on to explain to Palmerston "that an important service [viz., the exclusive possession of the town of Belgrade by the Serbs] would thereby be rendered to the Prince, and the influence of Russia in this and neighbouring provinces crippled to such an extent as to render it harmless, and at the same time I have an impression that it is only by such arts that any other Power

can hope to establish a solid ascendancy as opposed to that of Russia." In proposing this measure to Lord Palmerston, Hodges had in some way anticipated the latter's own inclinations; for, as a matter of fact, on 6 January, Lord Palmerston wrote asking Hodges to explain the specific measures which in his opinion could be resorted to by England with a view to inspiring Prince Miloš with confidence in the intentions of the British Government. Three weeks previously, on December 15, Hodges had been appointed Consul-General in order to increase his influence with the Prince of Serbia.

IV.

At the beginning of 1838 then, the affairs of Miloš took a good turn, or at least so it appeared. The instructions of the British Government to its ambassadors at Vienna and Constantinople to work in the interests of Miloš had given a practical and good result. In January Austria admitted the British idea that Miloš should send deputies to Constantinople in order to get a Constitution for Serbia. Even Metternich consented in principle to change the Austrian Consul in Serbia, who was known to be opposed to Miloš. But the most important success was the fact that the Porte on the demand of Lord Ponsonby, sent directions to the Pasha of Belgrade to inform Miloš that he might send deputies to Constantinople. On 30 March, Miloš received this invitation. He was beside himself with joy, and immediately sent the news to Hodges, begging him "to offer his grateful thanks to Her Majesty's Government for this proof of the interest they have taken on behalf of Serbia." The members of the deputation were chosen at once, and appropriate letters of thanks were sent to the Sultan and to Reshid Pasha; later on, these were followed by important money presents. The three delegates, Avram Petronijević, Jakov Živanović and Jovan Spasić, left for Constantinople on 29 April. Before the deputation left, Miloš said to Hodges: "If your Government can prevail upon the Porte to fulfil the Hattisheriff of 1830 and annul the Hattisheriff of 1833, by which the most important of the privileges granted to this country by the Hattisheriff of 1830 were withdrawn, you will see how completely the Russian party will lose all power of action and be destroyed." He asked Hodges to tell Lord Ponsonby that he—Miloš—"will gladly sacrifice any sum of money to reposest the Serbians of that privilege which gave them the exclusive occupation of the

town of Belgrade, the Turks being restricted to the fortresses of which they have possession."

In bringing to the notice of Lord Palmerston this desire of Miloš with regard to Belgrade, Hodges repeated once more the reasons in favour of this concession on the part of the Porte. He affirmed that he was sure of the sincerity of the Prince when he spoke of his entire dependence upon Her Majesty's Government. Both his pride and ambition had been deeply wounded by Russia, and he would certainly become attached to Great Britain, who would serve as his protectress against the schemes of Russia, and would also obtain other advantages for him.

In the way of fulfilment of the Hattisheriffs of 1830 and 1833 Palmerston had already given positive instructions to the ambassador. On March 16, he instructed him to recommend to the Porte that the Turks residing in the town of Belgrade should leave their estates "in consideration of the payment by the Prince of a fair pecuniary compensation for the concession." The British Government favoured not an evacuation pure and simple, but a solution on the basis of redemption, which suited Miloš perfectly, as he had put forward this policy in 1830, but had been stopped by the Porte's action in forbidding Moslems to sell their estates.

Miloš had not yet come to the end of his good news. In May, Ponsonby, knowing that Miloš was surrounded by people who were disloyal to him, invited Hodges to come to Constantinople, in the first place "to look after the conduct" of those into whose hands Miloš had entrusted his chief interests, and afterwards to serve Ponsonby as expert in Serbian affairs. This news was extremely agreeable to the Prince. "He became very much excited and without the smallest restraint expressed his unbounded joy at such a circumstance." He begged Hodges to go, adding that his doing so was the only chance of success, and that he fully empowered him to act and to propose such measures as he might deem expedient. "Let my government of this country," added the Prince, "be placed upon a clear and specific footing, so that I may be unrestrained and free from the interference of Russia. I shall never be found unfaithful to the Porte, and as a pledge of my sentiments upon this subject, I am now sending a handsome gift to the Sultan."

Hodges gave Miloš the best assurances, and communicated to Lord Palmerston without delay the engagement into which he had entered with the Prince with regard to Russia, whose goodwill he had utterly forfeited. "The Prince places the

most unbounded confidence in the national honour and good faith of Her Majesty's Government, by whose assurances alone he was encouraged in his determination not to submit to Russian dictation." On 20 May Hodges set out for Constantinople. When he took leave of Miloš the latter declared that, if the negotiations at Constantinople should terminate unfavourably for Serbia, he would quit the country for ever and let Russia do with it what she pleased. Consequently the question of the Senate was the principal object to be treated at the Porte. With regard to this problem Palmerston definitely wrote to Ponsonby on 18 May, that the British Government "quite concurs with Colonel Hodges as to the danger which would arise from the appointment of a Council, the members of which were for life and not removable by the Prince." During the negotiations in Constantinople, Serbia would do well to be as quiet as possible. Palmerston instructed Hodges to recommend Miloš to abstain from any act which might give Russia "any just cause of offence, and to avoid coming to any such open rupture with that Power as would afford her any plausible pretext for hostile steps against Serbia." On the other hand, of course, Miloš must "firmly and perseveringly refrain from acting upon her suggestions, whenever those suggestions shall, as it is probable they generally will, tend to the injury of the Prince and to the mere promotion of the interested views of Russia."

The Foreign Office did not hesitate to demonstrate directly to Russia its interest in Serbia. On 20 April, 1838, Palmerston—on the basis of Hodges' report concerning the Russian Commission, which, according to Miloš, was to be sent to Serbia—instructed the British Chargé d'Affaires at St. Petersburg to inform Count Nesselrode that the British Government considered this news a mere fabrication, "because Serbia is a province of the Turkish Empire, and there are no treaties between Russia and the Porte which give to Russia such rights as the appointment of such a commission would imply." When Milbanke put the question to Count Nesselrode with regard to the commission, the latter replied without hesitation that his Government had never entertained such an idea, and gave him some information concerning the mission of Prince Dolgoruky in the previous October, adding that in whatever Russia had done, she had the approval and concurrence of the Porte, and that "if everything that had been done by Russia with regard to Serbia for some years past had been properly represented to Her Majesty's Government, he was

quite sure it could not do otherwise than also approve the wisdom she had shown." The British *Chargé d'Affaires* observed that if Count Nesselrode felt so confident on this point, he was only doing himself and the Russian Government an injustice in not making her policy more public and thereby removing the erroneous ideas which seemed generally to prevail on the subject. Count Nesselrode further remarked that he was at a loss to understand the motives by which the British Government was actuated in apparently supporting Prince Miloš in his despotic mode of government, while that of Russia was labouring to alleviate the burdens and ameliorate the condition of the people. It would, he said, almost seem that in this particular instance the views of the two Governments were reversed. He then asked: "Why it had been thought expedient to name a British Consul in Serbia, a country with which England had no commercial relations to require protection." Upon the *Chargé d'Affaires* answering that though not acquainted with the reason, he would take upon himself to say that the innovation had not been made without some good and sufficient cause, Count Nesselrode replied: "I will tell you why. It is the apprehension your Government entertains that Russia should seek to acquire and exercise a paramount influence in Serbia, in favour of which I heartily wish my Government had never interfered, for it has reaped nothing but embarrassment and annoyance from the interest which it has taken both in it and the neighbouring provinces."

In communicating this conversation to Palmerston, the *Chargé d'Affaires* added that he had made all possible enquiries in order to discover whether there existed an arrangement between Austria and Russia to divide certain Turkish provinces between them, but that he had not discovered anything.¹

Austria, indeed, exhibited the greatest passivity in the Serbian question. Her new Consul Filipović came to Belgrade on 30 March, but took no part in political affairs. The British Ambassador in Vienna did not cease to insist on the necessity of an active Austrian policy. Metternich, however, was immovable, or proposed such negative measures as the withdrawal from Serbia of the Consuls of all foreign Powers. This proposal did not please Palmerston, who on 15 May replied to Lamb:—"It seems to me that it would be extremely inexpedient to agree to this proposal of Prince Metternich, which would in practical effect be tantamount to surrendering Serbia wholly and entirely to Russian domination. For it is obvious that Russia would

¹ 16 May, 1838. Milbanke to Palmerston.

find innumerable means of exercising influence in Serbia even though her Consuls were withdrawn, whereas the British Government has no effectual channel of communication with the Prince of Serbia and with the leading persons of Serbia except the British Consul General. Prince Metternich . . . if he had intended merely to make himself the instrument of Russia, could not well have suggested a measure which would be more convenient to that Power."

To the end Great Britain avoided inviting France to take part in the politics of Serbia. It was evident that such a policy would unite Austria openly with Russia in opposing it.¹ In the main the diplomatic conflict between Russia and Great Britain in Serbia was not complicated by the interference of other Powers. It remained a duel to be decided in Constantinople.

MICHAEL GAVRILOVIĆ.

¹ 1 April, 1838. Lamb to Palmerston.

THE RADICALS OF THE SIXTIES AND THEIR LEADERS.

It SEEMS to be a commonly accepted view of the Emancipation of the Serfs, that however oppressive and obscurantist may have been the policy of Nicholas I., this great work of Alexander II., the Tsar Liberator, stamps him as a man who looked upon Russia in a totally different spirit from any of his predecessors and that, if he lost much of his reforming ardour after Karakozov's attempt on his life in 1886, it must have been this shock that largely caused him to lose faith in the wisdom of his reform policy. But the Russians themselves have never been able to decipher the character of Alexander II, who, like Alexander I, is one of the most enigmatic personalities in history. In Russia it has been very seriously doubted whether Alexander II at any time during his career ever really meant to recognise, even in theory, that the Russian nation, when sufficiently developed, had the moral right to some genuine form of self-government. The Slavophiles took refuge in a blend of religious and patriotic mysticism, either believing or wishing to believe that God, the Tsar and the Russian people formed some mystical unity. The autocracy had no objection to their writing as much as they pleased on the subject, but directly they began to speculate in every-day practical politics, it was very promptly intimated to them that they were trespassing. All parties were treated by the Government in an equally arbitrary and high-handed fashion. It may be said that all the "live" and valuable elements of the Russian *intelligentsia*, whether consciously or subconsciously, have had their doubts as to the real moral foundations of the late autocracy, which was able through the Holy Synod to make a convenient use of the religious sanctions of the Russian Orthodox Church.

While the men of the Forties were able to make various compromises, sometimes combining many apparently contradictory conceptions, the young Radicals or the Nihilists of the Sixties, together with one or two former Liberals like Serno-Solov'yevich, very soon convinced themselves that all such compromises only helped to strengthen the autocracy in its patriarchal spirit and arbitrary methods. Whether the Radicals were really right or wrong in their attitude to the men of the

Forties, is a question which seems to depend on what may be revealed by future research into the inner history of the autocracy, especially under Alexander II. In his *Eve of the Emancipation 1855-1861*, published at Petrograd in 1916, Professor Nestor Kotlyarevsky remarks that however justly the early Radicals of the Sixties may be criticised on the score of recklessness in tactics and methods, it was these same Radicals who first discerned and fully estimated the tendency of the Autocracy "to give only an external meaning to the reforms provided, after having deprived them of their fundamental reality" (p. ix).

The first chapters of this very enlightening book appeared in four successive numbers of the *Vestnik Evropy*¹ (*Messenger of Europe*). Professor Kotlyarevsky points out that it only then became possible to attempt a full and impartial account of the first years of the long period closing in 1905. That half-century was rather the epilogue to earlier Russian history than the commencement of a new era. Owing to the great disparity in numbers between the Conservatives and the Progressives, in their mentality and their methods of action, a compromise was out of the question.

The historical rôle of the early leaders of Nihilism, and the later trend of the spirit of negation, especially in its bearing on religious tradition, have not yet received adequate attention in the West. A good historical perspective of the many confusing elements in the life of Russia during the Sixties is very greatly to be desired, as there is so much personal bias and subjective colouring in the literature dealing with these matters. The English reader may, therefore, be glad to have Professor Kotlyarevsky's estimate of the main social movements in Russia at the beginning of the Radical or Nihilist movement.

Although the conditions of peasant life immediately before and after the Emancipation have to be deduced largely from descriptions given in the ethnographical novels of that period, it may be assumed that there was very little essential change in the economic position of the present. Though many external shackles had been thrown off, and new financial and juridical machinery had been constructed to meet the new legal status of the peasants, the old spirit of serfdom could not be banished all at once. The landlords could not always discipline themselves sufficiently, to help the former serfs to realise the privileges and the duties involved in the new relationship. The question was all the more difficult because the peasants never acknow-

¹ August to November 1910.

ledged the right of the landowners to the land which still remained in their hands.

At the close of the Crimean War, all sections of the *intelligentsia* were so overjoyed at the prospect of serfdom being ended, that they were able to sink all mutual recriminations. The year 1858, however, proved to be the turning point in the negotiations between the Government and the landlords. Henceforward the Radicals separated themselves very sharply not only from the autocracy, but also from the men of the Forties, who were nearly all moderates or Liberals. Yet the latter formed no solid body, but split up into small groups. It is useful to remember this, when we find the younger generation refusing to accept any ideas from the moderate older men. A useful standard by which to place the groups from right to left is their degree of faith in the power and value of personal initiative.

The great majority of the educated public accepted the official opinion of the Government. Yet there were many subdivisions among the officials, and consequently there was no general clear-cut programme, nor anything resembling party discipline. The general idea was that reasonable reforms must be introduced if Russia was to remain one of the Great Powers of Europe; but it was not proposed to help and train the nation to become fit for any measure of independence or self-government, either in the near or distant future. Compared with the majority which took up this attitude, the remaining groups of the *intelligentsia* or reading public made up a very small total. Thus, in spite of the strength and brilliance of a few personalities and the fine quality of theoretical reasoning which is common to the widely different groups forming the opposition, the small numbers of their adherents left them in such a weak position, that the autocracy only listened to them in order to have an excuse for suppressing every few months their natural means of self-expression, that is, their journals.

Of these oppositional groups, the Right was occupied by the Slavophiles and the "Pochvenniki." The Slavophiles had lost Ivan Kireyevski, Khomyakov and Constantine Aksakov at the end of the Fifties, and their only remaining leader, Ivan Aksakov, felt that his position was almost one of isolation. The "Pochvenniki," a still smaller group than the Slavophiles, made a cult of the virtues of the Russian peasant. They were too cautious to discuss the rights of the soil, but declared that the *intelligentsia* had no justification for belittling the cultural value of the peasants' qualities. Thus Apollon Grigoryev used

literary and æsthetic criticism as a means for combating the Radicals and also many of the Liberals. Dostoyevsky was the other prominent member of this little group, and acted as its spokesman on the element of religious mysticism in peasant life. A third group consisted of landlords, who wanted a constitution on the lines of the English Tory model of the XVIIIth century. Professor Kotlyarevsky makes the interesting remark that the protest of the landlords against bureaucracy and tutelage, was the first that came from a closely-knit class and on a definite class basis. Till then, complaints had only been made from the individual standpoint.

Fourthly, there were the Liberals, or men of the Forties. This was a very heterogeneous group of men who varied widely in temperament and in social and political views. They were not united on any definite general programme. Their subdivisions may be roughly classified as follows: (1) a small number of landowners who had studied at a University in the Thirties or Forties, finished their education abroad and returned to Russia to live on their estates, though they were bored and dissatisfied with the laws of Russia under an autocracy; (2) university professors, chiefly historians and jurists, humanists and philosophical idealists; the elder men were more interested in abstract spheres of thought, while their younger colleagues were specialists in Russian history and the history of Russian law; (3) authors and literary critics who, though not young in years, were young in mind and not afraid to do their best to throw light on the social evils arising from serfdom; the chief of these writers were Turgenev, Goncharov, Saltykov, Nekrasov, Ostrovsky and Pisemsky; (4) a few publicists who opposed Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov and the new Radical publicists. With the exception of Katkov, who maintained a correct liberal tone in the *Russky Vestnik* (*Russian Messenger*), Kavelin and B. N. Chicherin, the Liberal publicists were purely literary men who were unaccustomed to writing publicistic articles.

At the beginning of 1860 the Liberals mostly went over to the official side. Some of the best known of them quarrelled among themselves; for instance, Turgenev and Nekrasov disagreed over Dobrolyubov, whose article "When will the real day come?" hurt Turgenev's sensibilities. In addition to all the groups mentioned above, there were also a small number of Liberals among the higher officials in the Government service, but their position was tragical and they could not remain long

in office. Two famous men of the Forties still remain to be mentioned, Herzen and Bakunin. Neither of them had a political programme which was positive and practicable for the new Russia of 1861. Herzen, who did not agree with Bakunin's policy of violent, ruthless destruction, had the goodwill and support of all Liberals and many officials, when the *Kolokol* (*Bell*) appeared in 1857. Katkov, B. N. Chicherin and others visited Herzen in London at his house at Putney, but the Slavophiles could not pardon Herzen's enthusiasm for Feuerbach's materialist and utilitarian philosophy. The Radicals soon became dissatisfied with Herzen's ever-changing attitude to Alexander II. He annoyed them also by his marked tendency to theorise indefinitely on questions which appeared to them to demand definite decisions and vigorous action. The undercurrent of scepticism, which was apt to creep into his most passionate utterances, was also noticed by the young generation in Russia. Directly the Liberals as well as the Radicals began to notice that Herzen had no positive programme to offer, but only his temperamental contradictions and the continual stream of brilliant but merely destructive criticism of everything in Russia, his influence quickly began to decline. He had the misfortune to be condemned as a Radical by the Liberals, while the Radicals considered he was a Liberal. Hence Dobrolyubov was able to become at once the intellectual leader of the young Radicals, who saw in him one who belonged to their generation and had passed through the same psychological experiences on leaving school as they had. At that time the Radicals were lacking in the general knowledge which they needed to understand Chernyshevsky's writings. But Dobrolyubov's superior literary talent stood him in good stead in his famous article "What is Oblomovism,"¹ in which he delivers a general attack on all Liberals, accusing them of being adepts at intellectual and spiritual Oblomovism in their attitude to public matters. It is useful to remember that the Liberals had not shown a solid and united front in 1858, when the efforts of Alexander II. in regard to the emancipation had been obstinately opposed by the "krepostniki" or reactionary elements among the landowners. The result was that the best hopes of men like Chernyshevsky were destroyed. Chernyshevsky was an older man and had a much larger stock of seasoned knowledge than either Dobrolyubov or Pisarev could think of laying claim to.

¹ *Oblomov*, the well-known novel of Goncharov, describes the inertness and passivity of Russian life.

Consequently this early negative attitude to the spirit governing the reforms is all the more noteworthy.

The crisis of thought took place for Chernyshevsky between April and December, 1858. In the fourth number of the *Sovremennik* (*Contemporary*), 1858, he was still able to praise the efforts of Alexander II. and the liberal landowners.¹ Alexander II., however, was greatly displeased with him, because he had published Kavelin's project for the emancipation of the serfs. The negotiations in connection with the redemption dues, and the requirement that the serfs and not the whole nation should compensate the dispossessed landowners, caused Chernyshevsky to lose all faith in any genuine peasant reform. "How foolish I was," he wrote in December, 1858, "to exert myself in a cause which there are no conditions to guarantee! Who but a fool can think of putting himself to the trouble of trying to arrange that property shall be *kept* in certain hands, when he has not first made certain that the property will actually *reach* those hands, and reach them on advantageous terms!"

Chernyshevsky, however, had little direct practical knowledge of agricultural life, so that the *Sovremennik* (*Contemporary*) produced scarcely any effect on the work of the Editing Commissions. These official bodies paid very much more respect to the advice and opinions of the *Zhurnal Zemlevladeltsev* (*Landlords' Journal*), and even the *Russky Vestnik* (*Russian Messenger*). The *Sovremennik* therefore concentrated all its energies upon influencing a wider public, and strove to produce by means of very skilful allegories a strong healthy spirit of hostility towards the conservative majority of the land-owning nobility. In 1858, also, the *Ateney* (*Athenæum*) published Chernyshevsky's article, "The Russian at the Rendez-vous." Ostensibly this article is a literary criticism of Turgenev's *Asya*, but in reality it was a bitter and passionate complaint that there were no men in Russian strong enough to get the emancipation question settled once and for all fairly and squarely. The Liberal landowners and the men of the Forties seemed to shirk taking the bull by the horns. But there is also much animosity and bitter sarcasm towards the landowning nobility in general. Chernyshevsky, who was the son of a priest and had been educated at a theological seminary, seems to speak for the young Radicals and "men of mixed class" in the following passage: "We have not the honour to be his relatives (*i.e.*, of the hero in *Asya*); between our families there has been even a feeling

¹ See the article "On the new conditions of country life."

of dislike, for his family used to despise all those near to us; but we cannot yet tear ourselves away from those ideas which were crammed into our heads from the lying books and lessons on which we were brought up, and by which our youth was ruined . . .” He then advises the landowners to seek reconciliation with their adversaries the serfs while there is yet time, for the peasants have not yet come to realise that their law suit is bound to get a definite settlement. As this is so, the landlords, if they seized the favourable opportunity that was still open to them, could make a friendly arrangement with the peasants which might be advantageous for them, not only from the money point of view, but also because it would give them the prestige of being thought generous; they would show that they had heard, so to speak, the voice of conscience and humanity.

It is evident that a certain democratic and temperamental antipathy has much to do with the underlying feeling of this article. Chernyshevsky’s encounter with Herzen, who belonged by birth to the land-owning nobility, provides further evidence of the same state of mind. But Herzen, who has often been described as a revolutionary socialist, was particularly subject to emotional changes and moods. A romantic aristocrat, and a passionate upholder of the socialistic and democratic foundations of the peasant commune, he could not bring himself to sympathise with the ideals of the radical wing of the *intelligentsia*. The universities of the Sixties were filled with a new type of student, called *raznochintsy*, or “men of mixed class,” who had been born and brought up in humble homes in the provinces and had come to St. Petersburg or Moscow to attend the university lectures, earning their livings at the same time by giving private lessons for very small fees. Embittered by a strong sense of social injustice, they were eager readers of the *Sovremennik*, and, later, of the *Russkoe Slovo* (*Russian Word*). Both Dobrolyubov and Pisarev regarded this class, which included men and women in almost equal proportions, as the real hope for the future of Russia. But just as the ramshackle gathering of emigrant *raznochintsy* at Baden-Baden described in *Smoke* seems to have produced a painful, jarring effect on the artistic and aristocratic nature of Turgenev, so Herzen, who had met a few of the *zhelcheviki* (embittered) for the first time in 1850 near the Rhine, felt that there was a repellent tone of plebeian self-opiniatedness and self-assertiveness in Dobrolyubov’s attitude to the men of the Forties. The harshness of the spirit which he saw in “What is Oblomovism?” called forth from Herzen an energetic reply

in his article "Very dangerous!!!" which was published in the *Kolokol (Bell)*¹ in 1859. Chernyshevsky thereupon made a hurried and secret journey to London to heal the discord between Herzen and the *Sovremennik*. This interview in London was unsuccessful, and was described in the *Kolokol* in 1860² by Herzen in another brilliant article—"Superfluous people and men with a grudge." The following short accounts by Chernyshevsky and Herzen of their mutual impressions throw a clear light on how the two types of men regarded each other. Chernyshevsky said of Herzen: "What a clever man, what a clever man—but how out-of-date he has become! . . . He thinks that he is still playing the wit in Moscow drawing-rooms and is arguing with Khomyakov. But now time is moving terribly fast; one month is equal to ten of those years! If you take a close look at him, you can see that inwardly he is still the Moscow *barin*." Herzen's opinion of Chernyshevsky is equally characteristic: "A wonderfully clever man and so much the more astounding is it that with such an intellect he should have such self-conceit. He is sure that the *Sovremennik* is the hub of Russia. They have put backward people of our sort completely into the shade. Well, I think they are rather too much in a hurry to play the funeral march for us; we are not dead yet."

Owing to the strong personal element that distinguishes them, the articles mentioned above read like human documents. Overshadowing all these things, however, was the all-absorbing question, what would be the final conditions of the emancipation of the Serfs? No party felt at ease on this point, and indeed the strength of the spirit that survived from the preceding reign may be judged from the very wording of the Imperial Manifesto itself. At first, Y. F. Samarin and N. A. Milyutin were entrusted with the drawing up of the Manifesto; but Count Panin, the Minister of Justice, found that the liberal spirit expressed in it was not to his taste. He therefore persuaded the Emperor to have it re-edited. Knowing that Filaret, Metropolitan of Moscow, was not only held in high esteem at Court, but was also not in favour of emancipation, Count Panin suggested to Alexander II. that if the Manifesto were passed on to Filaret for the final revision, it could not be placed in better hands. The Metropolitan accepted this commission with great reluctance, but subjected the Manifesto to a drastic revision. He struck out the sentences which referred to the joy which the whole

¹ No. 44.² No. 83.

nation would feel at the great event, and on the following day, 6 February 1861, he explained this by saying that only the partisans of "theoretical progress" could rejoice at the emancipation. Some years later, the Academician M. I. Sukhomlinov, writing in the first number of the *Istorichesky Vestnik* (*Historical Messenger*), 1885, referred to Filaret as follows: "Owing to his frame of mind and to other reasons, he did not sympathise with any material changes in the life of the peasants and preferred to keep to the old-established order of things. But, though not sympathising with the liberation of the serfs, Metropolitan Filaret was obliged to become its first herald." One or two exceptions among the higher clergy are mentioned by Dzhanshiev in his *Epokha Velikhikh Reform* (*Epoch of the Great Reforms*),¹ namely, John, Archimandrite at Kazan Theological Academy, who on the ground of I Cor. vii, 20-23, declared serfdom to be a heathen institution contrary to the spirit of Christianity, and Gregory, Bishop of Kaluga, who, in 1858, in the face of much opposition, stated that he believed in emancipation.

By 1861 the Radicals, hating the Government's leanings towards the theocratic spirit, had become irreconcilably opposed to official authority. Instead of attempting to allay the excitement among the students by giving them a responsible part in practical work for the peasants, the Autocracy exasperated them still further by forcing upon them a rather antiquated programme of studies, specially designed to counteract the influences of Western scientific thought. Neither the Autocracy nor the Church could prevent these influences from coming into Russia, for not only the students, but also many of the higher bureaucrats, were determined to taste of the "forbidden fruit." The writings of Buckle, Macaulay, Motley, Prescott, and J. S. Mill, together with those of Guizot, Thierry, Michelet, Schlosser and Ranke were, in the Sixties, hastily translated, and as hastily read. Dobrolyubov and Pisarev set themselves to popularise this new knowledge as much as they could, though, owing to the shortness of their careers, they were never able to digest the material properly for themselves. It will be of interest to English readers to know that one of the articles written by Dobrolyubov is a biography of Robert Owen, the Utopian socialist, and an exposition of his ideas. In general one may say that most of these popular articles suffer from the prevalence of self-confident assertions founded upon rather

¹ 8th ed., 1900, p. 62, footnote.

chaotic knowledge. Thus the early Nihilists of the Sixties, when they broke away from the traditions of conservative Russia, were left without any real guide. Not until the beginning of the Seventies, when Lavrov's *Istoricheskia Pisma* (*Historical Letters*), and Mikhailovsky's "What is Progress?" made their appearance, did a steady influence begin to exercise some control over the minds of the younger people.

The extremes of Nihilist thought were due to the writings of Pisarev, who constituted himself the leader of the rising generation, those next in age being left to Antonovich and the *Sovremennik*. Whereas this journal put more emphasis on social and political programmes of thought and action, Pisarev and the *Russkoe Slovo* held that nothing of this kind was practicable until there were emancipated men and women. These ideal persons were to be known as "critically minded realists," who would reject everything in life which could not survive the fires of their criticism. Pisarev explains his premisses in the opening sections of his article "The Realists." Up till 1864 Russia, as a nation, had been held captive in a vicious circle of stupidity and poverty. She was poor because she was stupid, and stupid because she was poor. Therefore, he argued, the only way out for Russia was to produce a race of ruthless critics and realists, who would gradually increase in numbers by the conversion of other people. In this way Russia would at last be completely renewed and set on her own feet.

Pisarev's rejection, not only of metaphysics and the romantic Pantheism of the Thirties and Forties, but also of æsthetics, was regarded by the men of the Forties as almost sacrilege. But they do not appear to have realised very clearly that Pisarev's reckless and scornful tone was only a means of expressing his main object forcibly. For he desired not so much the destruction of art as such, but rather of the tendency to use æsthetics as a cloak, or even a smoke-screen, in order to avoid the actual spade-work of improving the conditions of the masses. A culture which is always content to remain in the possession of a few privileged circles is not really healthy or praiseworthy. This thought is well known, of course, to readers of Tolstoy. But the defenders of "art for art's sake" did not merely look for the vulnerable points in Pisarev's utilitarianism; his "Realists" were also attacked a few years later by Mikhailovsky, because they believed that might is right and that not being responsible for external circumstances, they were therefore not responsible for any base actions which they might have committed or might

commit in the future. The Modernists in Russian literature of the Nineties naturally refused to be held back by the Nihilist rejection of æsthetics, and Pisarev was subjected to severe castigation by the literary critic A. L. Volynski in his *Russian Critics*, 1896.

The influence of Dobrolyubov and Chernyshevsky was still active in the Seventies in the ideas propagated by the Chaikovtsy. Mikhailovsky's desire that social reform should precede political reform is in the tradition of Chernyshevsky. In the article, "The Struggle of Parties in France," published in the *Sovremennik* in September 1858¹ we find the following passage: "We have already often remarked that all the pleasing features of constitutional government have very little value for a man who has neither the physical resources nor the intellectual development for this political dessert." Again, Mikhailovsky, in his "Notes of an Ignoramus," defended Chernyshevsky, who was living in exile, from the slight cast upon him in 1876 by Kavelin and the *Nedelya* (*Week*) when they gave the Slavophiles all the credit for the preservation of the peasant commune. In 1876 also there appeared the second edition of J. S. Mill's *Principles of Political Economy* in Chernyshevsky's translation, together with his notes and additions.

The growing into prominence of the "men of mixed class" and their turbulent and passionate demand for the social reformation of Russia, give to the Sixties that special atmosphere which is in such marked contrast with the sluggish and reactionary period of Nicholas I. Whether the new leaven was good or bad is immaterial, for the past is past; but one can see by the phenomenon of Nihilism that Nature herself produced her own reaction against a spiritual and intellectual tutelage that had exceeded its function and so had begun to defeat its own ends.

H. T. CHESHIRE.

¹ Pp. 165-6.

PERCY'S RELIQUES, SIR WALTER SCOTT'S MINSTRELSY AND THE ROUMANIAN BALLADS.

LECTURING lately on English literature at the University of Bucarest, I was brought to look more carefully into both Percy's *Reliques* and Sir Walter Scott's *Minstrelsy*. I found in them a number of poems which, either in plot or in characteristic features, closely resemble certain Roumanian folk-products; and the analogies between them seemed to me to be no mere matter of curiosity, but likely to interest students of comparative literature.

I begin with Percy's *Reliques*. Eleventh in order, we find the ballad of *Child of Elle*. A knight receives from his love, together with a silken scarf and a ring of gold, tidings of her father's decision to marry her to another man. The knight loses no time. He goes and induces her to run away. In their flight they are chased and overtaken—first by the rival knight, who is slain, next by the father's pursuers; then, as the minstrel has it :—

“ Her lover he put his horne to his mouth,
And blew both loud and shrill,
And soone he saw his owne merry men
Come ryding over the hill.”

Thus all ends in a reconciliation to the advantage of the lover. This ballad is much similar to the Roumanian *Fata Cadiului*—*The Daughter of the Cadi*—also a story of successful elopement. But the subject is further developed in many Roumanian folk-tales, and the poet Eminescu gave it high literary expression in his *Fairy Prince of the Lime-Tree*, suffused with all the magic of the moonlight and the sleeping forests, through which the lovers ride on, as in a dream :

“ They pass the shadows, fade in the vales, while the horn full of longing sounds sweetly, sounds heavily.”

In *Fair Margaret and Sweet William*, as well as in *Lord Thomas and Fair Annet*, the unfortunate couples die of unrequited love. They are buried in a church and, though on opposite sides, the plants springing up from their graves intertwine, just as it happens in a Roumanian Ballad, *Inelul si Naframa*, where the

motive of the ring and the scarf is used, with something of miraculous foreboding power attached to them. I give an abbreviated prose translation of it :—

“ There was a Prince young and strong as the fir tree of the mountains. He wedded a village maiden, with a fair beautiful face. In setting out for the camp, the Prince one day spoke to her :

“ My beloved, take this ring and put it on thy finger ; when the ring rusts, know that I am dead.”

“ And thou,” she answered, “ take thou my silken scarf, embroidered with gold ; when the gold wears away, know that I am dead.”

Forth he went. On the way he halted by a spring in the woods. There he gazed upon the scarf. His heart was broken.

“ My valiant soldiers,” says he, “ wait here and enjoy yourselves. I left my sword behind.”

He turned homewards. Soon he met a rider :

“ Good fortune, young brave ! What news ? Whence comest thou ? ”

“ My lord, your father has cast your bride into a deep and wide lake.”

“ Take then my horse and lead it to my father. If he should ask what became of me, tell him that I plunged into the water to seek my beloved one.”

The King dried up the lake and there he found them in each other's arms, lying on the golden sand. They bore them to the church. The Prince was buried by the altar, to the east ; his bride in the aisle, to the west. And from him, there grew up a fir tree, bending over the church ; from her—a tender, flowery vine, which spread and mingled itself with the fir tree.”

In the English Ballads, instead of the vine and the fir tree, one finds a briar and a birch or a briar and a rose—as for instance in *Fair Margaret and Sweet William* :—

“ Margaret was buried in the lower chancel,
And William in the higher :
Out of her breast there sprang a rose,
And out of his a briar.”

“ They grew until they grew unto the church top,
And then they could grow no higher ;
And there they tyed in a true lovers' knot,
Which made all the people admire.”

This kind of story, which often occurs in folk-lore, no doubt implies an old superstitious belief in the soul embodying itself in a tree over one's grave, and it is also expressive of a high conception of passionate love, enduring beyond mortal bounds—love instinct with a sense of eternity.

That physical love is stronger than any other, is the theme of a ballad entitled *The Maid Freed from the Gallows*, which, though not comprised in the *Reliques*, was communicated to Percy afterwards. One meets in it with a girl who, being

sentenced to death, at the last moment begs the judge to wait awhile, as she sees her father approaching. Then she addresses the latter :—

“ O father, O father, a little of your gold,
And likewise of your fee !
To keep my body from yonder grave,
And my neck from the gallows-tree.”

The father refuses to redeem her ; so do all her kindred in turn—mother, brother and sister ; only when it comes to the lover he is ready to pay any amount, flinching from no sacrifice, for, says he :—

“ I am come to see you saved,
And savèd you shall be.”

The theme of this ballad is almost identical with the Roumanian *Giurgiu*, except for two points : It is a youth in the latter, not a girl, that is in danger ; and this is due to the circumstance that, as he slept under a tree, a serpent fell from the branches and entered his breast. The youth makes trial of all his nearest people, calls to them aloud to take out the serpent ; no one but his sweetheart dares : she thrusts her bare hand into his breast, and lo ! instead of a serpent, there is a beautiful girdle of gold—which is meant to be the reward of true and faithful love.

In the collection of Roumanian *Folk Poems* by Alexandri, the appearance of which was mainly due to the interest awakened throughout Europe by Percy's *Reliques*, one finds a little piece called *Blestemul—The Malediction*. I translate it in prose :—

“ A youth and a maiden pass on yonder hill. The youth sings and fondles his horse ; but the maiden sighs wearily and speaks to him :

“ Let me ride, beloved, for I am tired ; the road is rough and I can go no farther on foot.”

“ I would take thee gladly, sweet one, but my horse is small and weak in the legs. He can hardly bear my own body—the body with its sins, the belt with its weapons.”

“ Hast thou no pity and fear of sin ? Thou hast taken me from my parents and brought me into the wild woods. God grant that it may be according to my wish : mayest thou go on and on till thou fallest into slavery among the Turks, with thy feet in the stocks and thine arms in chains ; may the longing for me fill thy heart whenever the road is at its worst ; may thy horse stumble and throw thee on thy head, may thy right hand wither and thy left hand be shattered ; mayest thou marry nine times and have nine sons, marry again and have only one daughter ; may they pass thee whistling, and may she bring thee handfuls of muddy bitter water, so that thou wouldst drink and drink and think of my curse.”

The poem strikes me as being only fragmentary in Roumanian. There is no plot in it ; and when you have read it, you are left

somewhat puzzled. Why are the two found together ? Where are they going to, and what did the man think of that simple-minded, quaint imprecation ? Did he smile and proceed on his way, as though nothing had happened—he on horseback and she walking by his side ? All these gaps become quite clear if one turns to the English parallel in the *Reliques*, called *Child Waters*. The sin to which the Roumanian verses allude is explained by the words of Fair Ellen, when she says that her gown, too wide before, is now too straight. He tells her not to worry, but takes two shires of land. She would rather have the man. Next day Child Waters is bound northwards. Ellen wishes to accompany him as a foot page. He agrees, on condition that she shall shorten her gown and clip her yellow locks. And thus they proceed :—

“ She, all the long day Child Waters rode,
Ran barefoote by his side ;
Yett was he never soe courteous a knichte,
To say, Ellen, will you ryde ? ”

A situation very similar to that of the Roumanian ballad ; but Child Waters himself is far more heartless, for he makes the poor girl follow him even across a broad piece of water. Still he is at last overcome into marrying her, when he listens to Fair Ellen’s affecting little song, after the child’s birth in the stable :—

“ Lullabye, mine owne deere child,
Lullabye, dere child, dere ;
I wold thy father were a king,
Thy mother layd on a biere.”

In *The Bailiff’s Daughter of Islington*, a young wanderer through London chances to meet his old sweetheart, whom he does not recognise, having left her down at Islington seven years ago and not having seen her since. He enquires : where was she born ?

“ At Islington,” she says. The youth gets more interested.
“ Tell me whether you know the Bailiff’s daughter.”
“ She died, Sir, long ago.”

To this comes the answer :—

“ If she be dead, then take my horse,
My saddle and bridle, also ;
For I will into some farr countrye,
Where noe man shall me knowe.”

The girl then confesses that she herself is the bailiff’s daughter and quite ready to marry him.

In his large collection of *English and Scottish Ballads*, Professor Child gives eleven variants of this ballad. What appears in all of them to be only a faint echo of some bygone incident, has in the corresponding Roumanian ballad the deep, tearful pathos of reality. The ballad I refer to belongs to the Vlach population of Epirus and Macedonia. In these parts a man after getting married goes abroad to seek a living. It happens sometimes that he returns after many years' absence, and drops in unexpectedly like a wanderer from strange lands. Both his arrival and what follows are sung in a ballad of which I know three versions in the Vlach dialect; but it exists also among the Greeks and the Slavs, being inspired by conditions which are similar in all the country lying south of the Danube. The wife of the wayfarer, meeting him at the fountain or on the road, stands astonished and asks for evidence :

" If thou art in truth my husband, tell me the fashion of my house."

" An apple tree grows in the garden and a vine at the gate."

" That's known of all the neighbours and everyone may know it; tell me what signs my body bears, that I may be assured."

" Thou hast a mole on the chest, another in the armpit."¹

Then, of course, she gives him the welcome of a husband. The entire scene reminds one of that in the *Odyssey*, when Penelope, altogether lost in bewilderment, speaks to her son Telemachus :

εἰ δ' ἐτεὸν δὴ
ἔστ' Ὀδυσσεὺς καὶ οἶκον ἰκάνται, ἦ μάλα νῶϊ
γνωσόμεθ' ἀλλήλων καὶ λώϊον · ἔστι γὰρ ἡμῖν
σήμαθ', ἃ δὴ καὶ νῶϊ κεκρυμμένα ἴδμεν ἀπ' ἄλλων.

" If in very truth he is Odysseus, and has come home, we two shall surely know one another more certainly; for we have signs which we two alone know, signs hidden from others."²

And indeed, Odysseus proceeds to give a clear, manifest token of his identity.

I come now to Sir Walter Scott's *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*. One's attention is drawn here first of all to that admirable ballad of *Lord Randal*, which was already known in Italy some two centuries ago. It begins :

" O where hae ye been, Lord Randal, my son ?

O where hae ye been, my handsome young man ? "

" I hae been to the wild wood ; mother make my bed soon.

For I'm weary wi' hunting, and fain wad lie down."

¹ The Greek version of the whole poem has been translated into English by Lucy M. J. Garnett in her *Greek Folk Poesy*, Vol. I., p. 191.

² A. T. Murray's trans. (Loeb Classical Library), *Odyssey* xxiii., 107-110.

And in this way, by means of questions and answers, the story is very skilfully worked up to a climax; the mother, who has but a suspicion, gradually arrives at the dramatic conclusion :—.

“ O I fear ye are poison’d, Lord Randal, my son !
 O I fear ye are poison’d, my handsome young man ! ”
 “ O yes, I am poison’d; mother make my bed soon,
 For I’m sick at the heart, and I fain wad lie down.”

No doubt, his sweetheart is responsible for the foul deed, but one is not told the reason of it. If we turn to the Roumanian version of the ballad, found in Transylvania under the name of *Neguta*, instead of an accomplished fact, we are introduced somehow into the secret cause and preparation of the murder. A girl, forsaken by her lover, who is inclined towards another woman, takes counsel with her mother. The latter advises her to try to win back the lover, either by a curse or a spell or by presents :

“ Then, my mother, what shall I take him ?
 What gift shall I make him ? ”
 “ A handkerchief fine, little daughter,
 Bread of white wheat for thy loved one to eat,
 And a glass of wine, my daughter.”
 “ And what shall I take *her*, little mother,
 What gift shall I make her ? ”
 “ A kerchief of thorns, little daughter;
 A loaf of black bread for her whom he weds,
 And a cup of poison, my daughter.”¹

Here we see that in opposition to *Lord Randal*, the poison is intended here not for the lover, but for the woman who lured him away.

In *Clerk Saunders*, another Scottish ballad, we meet with the device of the hostile brethren, who, seven or nine in number, play such a large part in folklore. They kill here the lover of their sister; as they do in a Roumanian ballad, *Mogoș Vornicul*. Intermixed with the brethren there enters also in *Clerk Saunders* the supernatural element of the spectre—the same ghastly form, which out of the popular domain was to be seen gliding with a shadowy presence of terror and mystery through many a literary production; beginning with Bürger’s *Lenore*, rendered into English by Sir Walter Scott himself. It is an old widespread belief that one is liable to become a *revenant* under certain

¹ Countess Martinengo Cesaresco, *Essays in the Study of Folk Songs*, in Everyman’s Library, p. 179.

circumstances, for instance, a sudden and violent death, as in *Clerk Saunders*; or a strong attachment to persons still living, to whom one is drawn by the simple power of love—as is the case in *Proud Lady Margaret*. Here the dead returns at night to a lady, in the guise of a gallant knight. She wonders at the apparition and he discloses himself to be her own brother; then she wishes to go along with him, which of course is impossible, for, says the spirit:—

“ The wee worms are my bedfellows
And cauld clay is my sheets,
And when the stormy winds do blow
My body lies and sleeps.”

In a Roumanian version from Macedonia the story runs as follows: A mother had nine sons and only one daughter, by the name of Giamfichea. At the instance of the younger brother, Constantine, she consented to marry the latter to a distant country. No sooner had she departed than a pestilence broke out and the mother with her nine sons all perished, leaving behind a desolate house. When Giamfichea returned, her brother Constantine stood in the doorway to greet her. In amazement she looked at him. She spoke: “My brother, what is it? A smell as of damp earth is about thee . . . Art thou alive or dead? And tell me, where are all the others—my mother and my brothers?”

“Down they lie in the ground; I only rose from the grave; with deep longing I hastened and came here to meet thee.”

In the Vlach text:

“Cu dor mare ȃmi-alăgai,
Viȃniu aua di ti-aștiptai.”

The story forms also the subject of other ballads, in which the spirit hurries to fetch his sister, driven by the curse of the mother. This may be compared with the curse that brought about the visit of the three dead sailors in the *Wife of Usher's Well*:—

“I wish the wind may never cease,
No fish be in the flood,
Till my three sons come home to me,
In earthly flesh and blood!”

The spectre-ballad is very diffused throughout Europe and especially in the Balkans. Professor Politis, who wrote a special monograph, *The Popular Song about the dead Brother*, gives no less than seventeen versions of it. Very impressive in some of

these, as well as in a Roumanian one, is the episode of the spectre riding with his sister, when the birds hover about and utter aloud in a human tongue their astonishment :—

“ Who has ever seen a fair maiden and a dead man riding together ? ”

“ Didst hear, my brother Constantine, what the birds are saying ? ”

In the Roumanian collection of Alexandri already mentioned there is the well-known *Cucul si Turturica*—*The Cuckoo and the Turtledove*, beginning :—

“ Dulce turturică,
Dalbă păsărică !
Hai să ne în iubim
Să ne dragostim . . . ”

I translate it in prose :—

“ Sweet turtle-dove, little white bird, let us love together ! ”

“ I should like to, but I fear your mother. She is a witch, and she would scold and scold . . . ”

“ Dear little turtle-dove, little white bird, do come and be my love ! ”

“ No, cuckoo, no ! Ask me no more ; for to be left alone, I will turn in o a reed.”

“ If you turn into a reed, I will change myself into a shepherd. I will find you and make a flute of the reed, that I may play on it, and kiss it.”

“ No, cuckoo, no ! I cannot listen to you ! Ah ! if it were not for your mother ! But rather than be with her, I would become a saint's image in church.”

“ Even then I will follow you. I will change into a deacon. And there, in the church, I will bow to you and worship you, saying, ‘ Little saint's image, turn into a bird again, and let us love and be together.’ ”

There are numerous variations of this poem, in some of which human beings take the place of birds. They might all be reduced to a simple, common type, symbolising the conflict between a tempting and an innocent spirit. In this, one is tempted to see a concrete example of the old Zoroastrian doctrine, which, together with other influences, entered Roumanian folklore, owing chiefly to the proselytising movement of the Bogomils. The poem found its way into many countries. In Provence Mistral used it with much literary skill in *Mirèio*. Thence, it was introduced by colonists into Canada. I find a similar version among Sir Walter Scott's collection, which, like the Vlach one I collected in Macedonia,¹ seems to be devoid of any dualistic tendencies.

“ “ O gin my love were yon red rose,
That grows upon the castle wa',
And I myself a drap of dew,
Down on that red rose I would fa'.

¹ See my *Papers on the Rumanian People and Literature*, London, 1920. p. 49.

O my love's bonny, bonny, bonny;
 My love's bonny and fair to see;
 Whene'er I look on her weel-faur'd face,
 She looks and smiles again to me."

O gin my love were a pickle of wheat,
 And growing upon yon lily lee,
 And I myself a bonny wee bird,
 Awa' wi' that pickle o' wheat I wad flee.
 O my love's bonny, etc.

O gin my love were a coffer o' gowd,
 And I the keeper of the key,
 I wad open the kist whene'er I list,
 And in that coffer I wad be.
 O my love's bonny, etc."

Such parallelisms among the ballads could be pursued still further. The question arises, how we are to account for them? First, the ballads I quoted are mostly Scottish; the life of yore in Scotland, its clan organisation, being similar to that of the Roumanians in communities known as *Calnicate* and *Voivodate*, a certain likeness is bound to be reflected also in the popular productions. On the other hand, a large number of these ballads are distributed throughout Europe. Having in each country a peculiar native freshness of their own, they none the less display essential resemblances, which would point to a common origin. This it is hardly possible for us to trace; for, like the old coins whose effigies are worn out, so the ballads do not show who put them first in currency. However, by striking a deep, emotional chord, beyond transitory fashions and conventions, they can be understood by everyone and in every age. As a Roumanian proverb puts it: "We are all made of the same paste," and in spite of our many divisions and differences, we have the same joys and the same sorrows, and there is the same ending for all of us. This simple, everyday truth, which we very often forget, the ballads through their general appeal bring home to us in a striking way, as it were a revelation. And here, as in any high literature, lies their humanising power—a power that makes for the crumbling of the walls of mistrust and opposition, as did the old prophetic song for the walls of Jericho.

M. BEZA.

A BRIEF OUTLINE OF THE RUSSIAN CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT.

No one now disputes that peace and normal economic conditions can only be re-established in Europe when Russia emerges from her present chaos. Opinions, however, are divided as to how the economic restoration of Russia is to be achieved. Many detailed projects, many clever schemes have been proposed: but, unfortunately, most of their authors do not see where is the chief motive force for the regeneration of Russia. They count on the Russian Government, on the intervention of foreigners, on an influx of capital from abroad, and they forget that both government help and foreign capital will only have sense and meaning when the Russian people itself sets its house in order after the wreck of the war and the Revolution.

Both Russian and European public opinion must grasp the fact that you cannot set in order a people—you can only help it to do this itself. It is only by following this rule that we can find a solution for the question, how the process of economic life is again to be set in motion in Russia.

But are there in the Russian people itself, in its history, its life, its social habits, those essential antecedents which would make it possible to hope that the course which I have mentioned will really be effective? Are the principles of independent initiative and self-help sufficiently developed in the minds of the Russian people for us to believe in the productive power of the masses?

These questions, especially for foreigners, claim the most careful attention and examination. If they only know the external history of Russia—the actions of those in the foreground, tsars, ministers and commissars—foreigners might easily lose sight of those imperceptible internal processes which have been and are at work in the depths of the national life. Yet, all the time, it is just these processes which are of importance; for it is only they that in the end define the history and life of peoples, their prosperity or their ruin.

In this article we wish to give a short sketch of the history

THE RUSSIAN CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT. 131

of the Russian Co-operative movement. We regard this movement as one of the most important internal processes in Russia, and believe that ultimately it may provide the remedy for those ills from which Russia has been suffering for the last few years. An acquaintance with Russian Co-operation will also make clear what justification there is for hope in the internal forces of the Russian people itself, in its initiative, its independent action, its social habits and psychology.

CO-OPERATION UP TO 1905.

The Co-operative principle in its primitive application entered into the life of the Russian people in the earliest times. The *artel*,¹ the *mir*,² the *supryaga* (the joint cultivation of land by separate peasants), and other forms of collaboration were used by the Russian peasants long before the actual principle of Co-operation was scientifically formulated in Europe. Thus, when, under the influence of theories brought from Europe—notably of Robert Owen, Fourier and Cabet—Co-operative associations of the modern type began to appear in Russia, they found a well-prepared soil in the instincts of the people.

Pre-reform Russia (before 1861) had no knowledge of the Co-operative movement. It could not then appear there; for one thing, the great majority of the Russian people had no instinct of personal property; for another, the political order of those days did not allow of any free association of citizens.

The first Co-operative society was founded in Russia in 1865, that is, soon after the introduction of the so-called reform of the peasantry, which freed millions of Russian cultivators from serfdom; but for the next thirty years, to the end of the nineties, the movement did not extend, for various social and economic reasons. Ordinary Russian agriculture retained very largely the characteristics of "natural economy," and exchange was only feebly developed. The Russian peasantry, which was the chief productive part of the community, poverty-stricken, backward in its technical methods and very poorly educated, was content to satisfy its needs with the products of its own labour. It hardly made any use of the products of factory industry, and therefore did not need to sell the work of its own hands on the

¹ The *artel* is an association of labourers for shorter or longer terms for the execution of a joint contract.—ED.

² The *mir*, or as it was latterly called the "village community," is the association of the heads of houses of a given village for joint payment of taxes and joint tenure of land.—ED.

market. Any surplus obtained by the work of the peasants was swallowed up by redemption dues, which, by the law of 1861, the peasants had to pay to their squires for the land assigned to them by the reform of that year, and also by government taxes. Thus practically no capital was accumulated by agriculture, nor did agriculture make any technical progress.

Naturally, in such economic conditions the Russian peasantry had no urgent stimulus towards the formation of Co-operative associations for the joint purchase of necessary goods or for the joint marketing of agricultural products; and thus distributive and agricultural Co-operation could find no room for development in the country districts. Another class of the people, the factory workers, who by their position in the community should have been interested in the development of distributive Co-operation, had not yet succeeded in separating themselves in any considerable number from the common mass of the peasantry. They still in many cases preserved their connection with the land, and did not develop into a real proletariat. Moreover, any development of distributive Co-operation among factory workers was much resisted by their employers. In their eagerness for profits, these set up in their works shops with the most needed articles and paid their workmen not in money, but in articles supplied from these shops. This truck system, thanks to the protection of the Government, greatly flourished in Russia, especially in the Eighties and the beginning of the Nineties. As for the rest of the town population—the small artisans and the small traders, in virtue of their social position, the *meshchane*,¹ in virtue of their backwardness, and the officials as belonging to the ruling families, did not offer any material for the development of Co-operation

A second cause which delayed the growth of Co-operation was the police system which flourished in Russia under Alexander II., Alexander III., and at the beginning of the reign of Nicolas II. The Russian autocracy, or rather the Russian bureaucracy, could not look favourably on such a free and independent popular movement as Co-operation. In every sign of initiative among the people, the Tsars' Government saw "sedition"; in every free popular organisation it surmised a mortal enemy to itself.

Apart from these purely police motives, the bureaucracy had

¹ *Meshchane*.—This name was given somewhat artificially to the lower population of the towns as distinct, on the one hand, from the merchants, and, on the other, from the peasantry. This class as such possessed its administrative institutions, but was never a real social unit.—ED.

others which tended to hamper the development of Co-operation. Possessed with a kind of mania of its own importance, the bureaucracy supposed that only it could properly settle all economic questions affecting the people—that the people should do only what it was ordered to do and only on the lines contained in these orders, but that its own initiative and activity should be suppressed. How great were the administrative obstacles created by police fear and bureaucratic arrogance may be judged by the fact that the statute of every separate co-operative society could up to 1897 only be confirmed by the Minister. Such a state of things confronted the organisers of co-operative associations with extreme difficulties which often wrecked their work at the very outset. “The old *régime* so hampered the opening of new societies,” writes Professor Ozerov,¹ “that those who wished to found one lost every desire to do so. I myself know cases in which applications for the confirmation of a statute went on for more than a year.”

Even when co-operative societies had successfully surmounted the difficulty of getting their statutes confirmed and had been able to set to work, they were still under the eye of the police. Many were the cases of interference by the government in their internal affairs, arrests of their employees, and even the closing of the societies by administrative order. Still, in spite of the unfavourable social, economic and political conditions, Co-operation, though very slowly, made its way forward. According to statistics of S. N. Prokopovich,² by the end of the XIXth century there were at work in Russia about seven hundred distributive societies, about fifteen hundred credit and loan-and-savings associations, and several hundred agricultural and industrial societies.

Towards the beginning of the twentieth century, those social and economic changes which had been maturing in the life of the Russian people at last took final form. The great increase of manufacturing industry, the extremely rapid construction of railways, the reform of the currency, the development of international trade, all of which developments took place between 1890 and 1900, showed very clearly that Russia had entered on the same type of development as at that time had finally established itself in Western Europe and America—the road of capitalism

¹ Ozerov, *Potrebitelnyia Obshchestva* (Distributive Societies), p. 189.

² S. N. Prokopovich, *Kooperativnoe Dvizhenie v Rossii* (The Co-operative Movement in Russia), St. Petersburg, 1903.

The tendencies and contradictions produced by this economic process were bound in their turn to produce, as they soon did, further changes both in the economics of the country and in the reform of its political life. Industry, developing rapidly, needed markets for the sale of its products; and as the only such market could be the non-industrial agricultural population, the old "natural economy" of the peasants had to give way to monetary exchange; in other words, the peasant, who had formerly satisfied nearly all his own needs from what he himself produced, was bound to sell an increasing proportion of his products on the market, in order to be able to satisfy needs of his own with goods produced in factories.

This economic change could not fail to make a deep impression on the whole manner of life of the Russian peasant. Backward, economically feeble, lacking the most elementary knowledge of what was happening all around him, the peasant could not quickly adapt himself to the new conditions. Hence that crisis in Russian agriculture which was so evident at the end of the Nineties and the beginning of the new century. The crisis was ultimately solved by the Government carrying out a number of important reforms to ease the position of the peasantry. The redemption dues were abolished. Assistance was given to emigration to Siberia, which in some parts helped to relieve the acuteness of land shortage. There was founded the Peasant Bank, which gave peasants easy credit for the purchase of land from the gentry. And, lastly, a law was promulgated which allowed the State Bank to issue to the peasants through special government institutions loans for productive purposes. These economic reforms, together with the political reforms which the Government was compelled to grant after the Revolution of 1905-6, stimulated a sudden outburst of the co-operative movement all over Russia.

FROM 1905 TO 1914.

In order to understand and appreciate why Co-operation succeeded in Russia in this period, one must have a clear idea as to the nature of the Russian economic system at that time. According to the figures of the well-known economist, S. N. Prokopovich,¹ the yearly revenue for the fifty provinces of European Russia was in 1910 approximately estimated at 16½ milliard roubles. Of this sum, agriculture with all its branches

¹ S. N. Prokopovich: *An Attempt to Estimate the National Revenue of Russia.*

accounted for 11-12 milliards. Thus the principal industry, from which the Russian people obtained about three-quarters of its yearly revenue, was agriculture. It is of importance further to determine what form of agriculture prevailed in Russia—large estates or small holdings. This we ascertain from the following figures, which are taken from the works of Professor N. P. Oganovsky. He estimates that even in 1905 peasants of the fifty provinces of European Russia held 85 per cent. of all the cultivated area, 93 per cent. of the working horses and $63\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the grain which went to market. According to the census of 1916, the peasants of these same fifty provinces by that time possessed 90 per cent. of the cultivated area and 95 per cent. of all the cattle; out of 1,200,000,000 poods of grain on the market, small peasant holdings yielded more than 900,000,000 poods, *i.e.*, more than 75 per cent. These figures make it possible to establish quite definitely two fundamental facts which characterise the structure of Russian economic life in the first ten years of the twentieth century. The chief industry of the Russian people, the industry which produced the greatest economic gain, was agriculture with its accompanying branches, and the organisation of agriculture had a peasant character—that is, one of small holdings.

That the small-holding is a sound and valuable form of agriculture is now admitted even by those who in general regard small holdings as less progressive than large ones. But if it is to flourish, if agriculture is to be as productive as possible, the small-holders will have to unite to carry out a whole number of economic operations by their joint efforts; in other words, the co-operative principle will have to be applied. The classical example of this is Denmark, which has been able through Co-operation in the course of some thirty years to produce exceptional results. This importance of Co-operation for agriculture by small holdings has been well expressed by Professor A. I. Chuprov,¹ who writes: "The application of Co-operation to agriculture is a no less important discovery than new technical methods of agriculture." We will only dwell on two functions where union is profitable to smallholders—as regards buying and selling. As his needs are comparatively modest and as he cannot offer large quantities of goods for sale, the balance of exchange for each separate peasant is usually extremely small. If he goes on to the market as a small buyer and small seller, the

¹ A. I. Chuprov: *Small Agriculture and its fundamental Needs*, published by "Slovo," Berlin, 1921, p. 47.

peasant loses both ways : he pays too much for the goods that he needs and receives too little for his own products. If one wishes to exchange to advantage and with economy, one must deal in large quantities. But how can this be done by the small buyer and the small seller? Obviously only by joining hands with his neighbour. But beyond this, by combining his purchases, the peasant is much more able to introduce better and more complete implements, and by combining his marketing he is enabled to improve the quality of the goods which he sells and to increase the productiveness of his labour. What wonders Co-operation can do in this direction is shown by the example of the Siberian Creameries. In 1900 the export of butter from Siberia was 512,118 poods and in 1913 it was 4,975,869 poods.

Thus, about the beginning of the twentieth century Russia had finally parted company with the old " natural " system of agriculture. The peasant, who was the chief producer, began to bring his products to market and to take back from the market a large proportion of what he needed. He thus entered the whirl of commercial competition. In this whirl he could only keep himself afloat with the help of Co-operation. In this change of economic conditions we must seek the explanation of that rapid development of Co-operation which must impress any student of Russian life in the last twenty years.

On the other hand, it was just then that political conditions also changed in a favourable direction. The revolution of 1905, though it did not finally destroy autocracy, did deal it such a heavy blow, that it was never able to recover. The Tsar's Government had to leave a certain measure of freedom to the initiative of the people. This was utilised by Co-operation, which, towards the end of this period, succeeded in winning most important legal guarantees for its existence. We have already described those processes which helped forward the growth and development of Co-operation among the peasants; but the industrial population, the factory workers, were also during this period inside the movement. Towards the beginning of the twentieth century the factory workers' movement in Russia assumed very considerable proportions. Under its influence, and with the establishment of sound principles of capitalism, the primitive forms of the capitalist exploitation of workers had to give way to new conditions. During this period workers' wages increased considerably, the working day was limited, and the truck shops disappeared. A higher standard of life for the industrial worker in Russia, as in other countries, had the result that the

THE RUSSIAN CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT. 137

mind of the working class as a whole turned to seek such social forms as would make exploitation impossible, or at least less burdensome. Class consciousness and social education among the workers made great advances during this period. Co-operation gave an outlet for these social tendencies as they developed among Russian workers, and it also brought them perceptible advantages either in obtaining products, or in the shape of a dividend. Owing to these causes, after 1905 distributive Co-operation among workers, especially in the large industrial centres, grew with rapidity and success.

The effect of the revolution of 1905 on the growth of Co-operation is shown by the following data as to the number of co-operative associations in Russia. :—

—————	1905.	1914.
Credit and Loan-and-savings Bank Associations	1,434	12,781
Distributive Societies - - - - -	1,000	10,050
Agricultural Associations - - - - -	1,275	5,000
Creamery and Cottage Industry Artels - -	2,000	3,000
Total - - - - -	5,709	30,831

CO-OPERATION DURING THE WAR AND THE BEGINNING OF THE REVOLUTION.

The outbreak of war in 1914 opened a new horizon to the Co-operative movement. As the country had to exert all its strength in the strain of the external conflict, the public naturally could not fail, for organisation and relief, to utilise so tried an instrument as Co-operation in any department of life where it could be employed. The government, which had earlier regarded Co-operation with great distrust and contempt, had from the beginning of the war to change its attitude. Co-operative societies, uniting large numbers of persons, were widely used in contracts for the army and in work for the defence of the country. Very soon, Russia felt an acute need of many objects of first necessity. Private trade, as everywhere else, profited by the occasion to raise prices. The ordinary citizen had soon to complain of the high price of living and to seek all possible means of reducing this evil. As Co-operation was the most effective way of combating high prices and shortage of goods, it was quite natural that

the population caught at this means; and from the beginning of 1915 the number of distributive societies and their business turn-over began to rise quickly. From the middle of 1916 Co-operation received a new stimulus to its development. As the stock of goods on the market was constantly diminishing, the government conceived the idea that they must be distributed more or less in proportion, and as there was no other apparatus for such a distribution except Co-operation, which had by that time succeeded in capturing a very large section of the country and town population, it was natural that the distribution of products controlled by the government should be handed over to the Co-operative institutions.

The collapse of industry, the weakening of the credit system, the disorganisation of transport, and a number of other causes compelled, first, small trade and, later, the bigger private traders to disappear gradually from the scene. This process was very greatly quickened by the revolution which began in 1917. In the end, especially after the *coup d'état* of the Soviets in November 1917, and the disorderly confiscation and "nationalisation" of private property which was then inaugurated, private trade virtually disappeared and Co-operation remained on the market with something very like a monopoly. The following figures show the dimensions of the Co-operative movement at the end of 1918 (in the absence of exact statistics these figures are in each case approximate):—

	1915.	1916.	1917.	1918.	1919.
Credit Societies - -	14,350	15,450	16,057	16,500	26,500
Distributive Societies -	10,900	15,203	20,000	25,000	40,000
Agricultural Societies -	5,000	5,500	6,000	8,500	8,500
Creamery and other Artels	3,300	3,600	4,000	4,500	5,000
Totals - -	33,550	39,753	46,057	54,500	80,000

These separate Co-operative societies formed more than 500 local unions and about 10 central unions. Their capital amounted to about 250,000,000 roubles. Their membership numbered about 20,000,000 persons. Co-operative unions controlled 5,000 various industrial enterprises, which employed about 50,000 workmen. The trade balance of all the Co-operative societies amounted to milliards of roubles.¹

But it must be admitted that real Co-operators, who had been building up the Co-operative machine in the difficult years

¹ It must be borne in mind that in 1918 the paper rouble was worth 25 kopecks.

of Tsardom, regarded the rapid growth of Co-operation during the war with great anxiety. Unquestionably this growth was not healthy. The ranks of Co-operation were filled with persons who had nothing in common with it and were not imbued with its ideas; among the directors of the movement appeared unworthy elements which, instead of regarding Co-operation as a social duty, thought only of their own reputation and interests. The tasks that faced Co-operation were beyond the strength of many of its leaders; lastly, it was clear that, owing to the general economic devastation produced by the war, the good financial position of Co-operation was only apparent. Co-operation during the war and revolution was a colossus with feet of clay, without any real cohesion of its separate parts, without any firm financial basis.

If there had not begun in 1917 the so-called "Soviet" period of Russian history, if the Constituent Assembly had guided the current of Russian life into a bourgeois-democratic channel, it is certain that many of the Co-operative societies and their unions would have gone bankrupt and ceased to exist. These societies were too weak to bear with impunity the storms and trials which accompany struggle and competition.

From this misfortune Russian Co-operation was saved by Bolshevism, but the medicine which it prescribed was more deadly than the disease itself. The Soviet Government, by a whole series of decrees and regulations, literally destroyed Co-operation, turning it into a piece of extra machinery in the State apparatus, which was now overgrown to the extremest limits.

CO-OPERATION IN 1919 AND 1920.

Unfortunately I have not space to establish the history of Cooperation in 1919 and 1920, even in its most general features; so I will confine myself to indicating two of the principal legislative acts of the Soviet Government as affecting Co-operation.

The first of these Acts, the decree of the Soviet of People's Commissars on Distributive Communes (March 20, 1919), decided that all existing distributive societies were to be liquidated, and transformed for each separate area of population into a distributive commune. The whole population, without exception, was to enter this "commune" without bringing into it any shares or contributions. The administration of the "commune" was to be chosen by all citizens possessing the franchise of the Soviet constitution; all "communes" were to be united into so-called

gubsoyuzy, i.e., unions of the "communes" of the given province; at the head of this system was to be a single union of the *gubsoyuzy* of all Russia, which received the name of the old Co-operative organisation "Tsentsosoyuz"; the local and central organs of the Commissariat of Food Supply received the right to introduce their own representatives into the directing boards of the "communes" of their unions and of the Tsentsosoyuz, and even to constitute the board of directors exclusively out of their own representatives. The "communes" and their unions were to carry out all orders of the Commissariat of Food Supply, being practically changed into government institutions for the distribution of products.

By this decree, which included also a number of other less important details, distributive Co-operation was stricken to death. All those features which distinguished Co-operation from local government, or from a government institution, were erased.

The Co-operators waged a stubborn struggle to preserve the old principles of Co-operation, and the decree of March 20 was carried out with great difficulties; still, it was carried out. By the end of 1919 there hardly existed anywhere in Soviet Russia even one distributive co-operative association working on the basis of voluntary association, independence of the State, and self-government. The Co-operators won only one victory: the distributive organisation to which the decree of March 20 gave the name of "commune" retained its old name of "distributive society."

The second Act of the Soviet Government, which finally extinguished all Co-operation was the decree of January 27, 1920. By its first clause all credit and loan-and-savings associations, so far as they had survived the general destruction, were abolished and fused with the co-operative societies. As to other types of co-operative union—creamery artels, cottage industry co-operation, agricultural associations, and so on, though they were allowed to exist separately from the co-operative societies, all their provincial and central unions were to be absorbed in the form of special sections in the corresponding institutions of distributive "Co-operation."

The result of these two decrees was that Co-operation was practically wiped off the face of the earth. Subjected to the organs of the government, the new institutions bearing the old names of co-operative organisations represented something between falsified local self-government with extremely limited functions, and bureaucratic departments.

THE RUSSIAN CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT. 141

The result of the Soviet's co-operative reforms was also most distressing, both from the economic point of view and from that of the Co-operative idea. The shares contributed and the capital of Co-operation amassed during all the preceding period were squandered. The industrial enterprises were nationalised; the working apparatus, constructed with great trouble, was smashed; the connections with the co-operating population were, by virtue of compulsory membership, destroyed; the authority, the influence and the confidence of the population were gone. In the place of Russian Co-operation, flourishing though not altogether sound, as it was in 1918, there was in Russia at the beginning of 1921 a co-operative wilderness, more hopeless than in the worst periods of the rule of Tsarist bureaucracy.

THE PRESENT POSITION OF CO-OPERATION.

The stormy month of March, 1921, brought with it the so-called new economic "policy" and, with this, also a new decree on Co-operation issued on April 7, 1921. Though this decree retains many of the features of former Soviet co-operative legislation—obligatory participation of all citizens in the co-operative society, absence of personal contributions, right of the government to appoint its own representatives to the directing boards of cooperative societies and unions, the execution, without right of refusal, of instructions of the organs of government—still it re-establishes in however faint a degree the independence of Co-operation from the State.

The distributive co-operative societies have their own means and can work more or less independently of the State. As to other kinds of Co-operation—agricultural credit and cottage industry associations—these are not hampered by compulsory membership and are allowed comparative freedom of election of their directing organs. Still, both materially and politically, the Soviet State continues to exercise a very considerable pressure upon Co-operation, which is still far from being able to regard itself as absolutely independent and free, as it was earlier.

However that may be, the news which has come from Russia in the last few months shows that, though very slowly, Co-operation is yet beginning to revive; in some parts of the country the apparatus is being restored, capital is being collected, and the connections with the population are being renewed. This process is extremely slow, with big pauses and conflicts, both through the desperate economic position and through unfavourable political conditions.

This revival of Co-operation which has already begun, proves one thing : in spite of all that the co-operative idea has had to undergo both from foes and from friends in the last few years, the need of the co-operative principle in the economic life of the people in general and in its chief department, agriculture, in particular, is so insistent that the people are instinctively drawn to Co-operation and face any sacrifices in order to restore it. This in its turn is a guarantee that in the future, in the economic restoration of Russia, there is an exceptionally important part to be played by Co-operation.

As to what kind of part this is likely to be, I think it useful to say a few words. As we have already seen, the most suitable sphere for co-operative action is agriculture by small holdings. If this is to prosper and become more rational and productive, the principles of self-help and independence will have to be applied, and these principles can only be realised in the form of free self-government and voluntary co-operation. In relation to the immediate future of Russia, Co-operation acquires a special importance in connection with the question of foreign credits. That such credits will sooner or later be given to Russia can hardly be doubted, for it is quite clear that it will be impossible to include Russia in the economic development of the world until her fundamental capital is restored. Evidently, Russia herself cannot by her own efforts create the instruments and means of production for the continuance of her economic life. Help will have to come from outside, from countries which are richer in capital. When the question of giving foreign credits is definitely faced, the creditors will have to consider to whom, under what guarantee and for what purpose these credits shall be given. Of all the different branches of Russian economic activity, the chief that is left after the war and the revolution is agriculture, which always plays a predominant part in the economic life of the country. Thus, as a sound investment, agriculture is the province of Russian labour which is most to be trusted to guarantee the interests of foreign creditors. Further, the progress of agriculture, which can supply foodstuffs and raw materials for the world market, will be important not only to Russia but to other countries. To whom, then, should credits be given, if they are really to fertilise Russian agriculture and not to be wasted on any unproductive objects? Foreign creditors cannot, of course, in the nature of things, have immediate relations with each individual peasant. This difficulty can only be overcome in one way : the credit must and should be given

to an association of the small peasants, that is, to Co-operation. One could hardly find any other institution which could more properly or more advantageously distribute this credit to productive effect among the most important branches of labour, and better safeguard the payment of debts by the most solid and trustworthy guarantee, than the organised labour of the many millions of the peasantry. The economic restoration of Russia is a need of the whole world, and the sooner foreign governments and foreign capitalist combinations understand the importance of Co-operation in the life and work of the Russian people, the better may we hope that Russia will surmount the misfortune which has befallen her and will return to the family of peoples with the rights of an equal.

A. BAYKALOV.

LAND REFORM IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

THE ideas circulating in foreign countries with regard to land reform in Czechoslovakia are of a very misleading character. We find, for example, the assertion that all the large estates have been confiscated there, when not a square foot has been confiscated. Or it is reported that the land is expropriated, but that the compensation is so inadequate as to make this process identical with confiscation, when actually the compensation is fixed by the average price in the open market between 1913 and 1915, with the result that the compensation is on a higher scale than that paid in carrying out land reform measures elsewhere—for instance, in Germany.

In order to arrive at an impartial judgment of the land reform in Czechoslovakia, it is necessary to consider the conditions under which it came into being. It is certainly remarkable that only a few days after the establishment of the new Czechoslovak State on October 28, 1918, the provisional Government, composed of representatives of all political parties, promulgated the first land reform measure, and that all subsequent measures dealing with this subject were passed unanimously by the National Assembly, from the extreme right to the extreme left.

The reason for this is simple. The conditions of land tenure could not continue. This is shown by the following table, illustrating the distribution of land in Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia. In Slovakia and Carpathian Ruthenia matters were certainly far worse, but for these districts there are no exact statistics available.

This disproportionate accumulation of land in the hands of a small group of aristocratic owners was the result of a long historical development, the origin of which dates back to the twelfth century. Its most disastrous features, however, were the Habsburg confiscations instituted after 1547 against the rebellious towns, and after the Battle of the White Mountain in 1620, against the revolutionary Protestant nobles. The victorious Habsburgs expelled the flower of the Czech nobility and gave or sold their possessions at absurdly low rates to their

LAND REFORM IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA. 145

OWNERSHIP OF LAND IN BOHEMIA MORAVIA AND SILESIA (1896) :—

Area per Holding, in Hectares.	Number of Holdings.	Area, in Hectares.	Per cent.
0- $\frac{1}{2}$ - - -	667,526	102,232	1·32
$\frac{1}{2}$ -1 - - -	201,389	144,393	1·86
1-2 - - -	180,542	256,684	3·31
2-5 - - -	176,826	560,855	7·22
5-10 - - -	103,497	744,079	9·59
10-20 - - -	94,960	1,354,689	17·46
20-50 - - -	51,813	1,449,353	18·68
50-100 - - -	4,181	276,924	3·57
100-200 - - -	1,126	151,984	1·96
200-500 - - -	567	173,954	2·24
500-1,000 - - -	214	154,240	1·99
1,000-2,000 - - -	165	240,503	3·10
More than 2,000 -	236	2,150,684	27·70
Total - -	1,483,042	7,760,574	—

followers, most of whom came from foreign countries, as is indicated by such names as Liechtenstein, Dietrichstein, Buquoy, Marradas, Huerta, etc. In his *Bohemia after the White Mountain*, the late Professor Ernest Denis describes this process in detail, and states that hardly a quarter of the land remained in the hands of its former Czech owners.

The greater part of the new landlords were Germans, or became Germanised, and with them also the small remnant of the Catholic Czech nobility. They never acquired any sympathies for the Czech people, and, during the recent war, which constituted the Czechoslovak nation's fight for liberty, a small portion of them adopted a passive attitude, while the majority assisted the enemies of the Czechoslovaks.

In all countries large estates tend to depopulate the areas around them, and for this reason the Czech territories suffered greatly through emigration. The Czech and Slovak emigrants flocked mostly to America, as well as to Westphalia and Vienna, where, under the influence of their surroundings, they became assimilated and lost their racial character. Fortunately, this does not apply to them all. In particular, the emigrants in America, France and Russia did not forget their native country during its critical period, and they supplied the beginnings of

the voluntary Czechoslovak armies, as well as large sums of money for carrying on the war of liberation.

These national factors must be borne in mind when we estimate the Czechoslovak land reform, for they are no less important than the economic and social factors which proved decisive elsewhere.

The first land reform measure, dated November 9, 1918, is of only a limitative character as regards the sale and mortgaging of land, and it applies to that category of large estates which are inscribed in the land register, a record going back to the thirteenth century. The actual legislation dealing with land reform was inaugurated on April 16, 1919. It comprises in particular the Bill for the expropriation of large estates. The term "expropriation" only imperfectly conveys the meaning of the Czech word employed, which is entirely new to the legal phraseology of the Czech language. It implies certain limitations in the rights of ownership applying to private property in land, for the advantage of the State. From the time that this law comes into force, the owners of large estates exceeding 150 hectares of arable land, or 250 hectares of any kind of land, including forests, cannot sell, divide, let or mortgage them without the sanction of the Government Land Office. Such land can be distrained upon only through the sequestration authorities. In accordance with this law the Land Office has the right to take over this property into its own management, this process to be carried out in principle in return for compensation. Where this is not done, however, the owner has the right of managing his property for his own benefit, but he is bound to observe the principles of proper management in so doing; otherwise the state can compel him to conform to proper management by placing his property under official control.

When the property is taken over by the state, the previous owner has the right of retaining 250 hectares according to his choice, and in cases where such a course is justified by economic considerations this amount can be increased to 500 hectares.

This law dealing with the expropriation of large estates is only an outline or framework which leaves the exact settlement of many important matters to subsequent legislation. Thus, the question of compensation for land taken over by the state was only dealt with in a law passed on April 8, 1920. The guiding principle is that the compensation is to be fixed in accordance with the average prices obtained by the free sale of large estates exceeding 100 hectares between 1913 and 1915.

In fixing a valuation it is necessary to consider the type of cultivation, the quality of the soil and its position. In accordance with the authorisation conferred by this law, the Government issued a scale of prices for estimating the value of the soil in various areas of the State. Any landowner who is dissatisfied with the compensation allotted to him has the right of taking his claim before the appropriate Courts.

The law dealing with compensation provided for the establishment of compensatory registers, to be kept by the provincial courts, which are five in number. In these registers are to be entered the amounts of compensation allotted to the former owners as their claims against the State. The State is bound to pay interest on these claims at the rate of 3 per cent. per annum and to amortise them at not less than $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum, as well as at any time after a quarter's notice to pay off in cash or in securities of an equal value, the rate of interest and the scheme for amortisation to be the same. The former owners of expropriated estates cannot demand immediate payment, but they are at liberty to cede their claims. The settlement of accounts and the keeping of the deposits involved in the payment of compensation are attended to by public banks (mortgage banks and municipal savings banks), which, in this connection, are known as "compensatory banks."

The law dealing with compensation contains also detailed clauses, the purpose of which is to ensure that those having substantiated claims or other rights (patronage, pensions, etc.) in connection with the expropriated estates shall not incur any detriment.

The land thus taken over is, in accordance with a special law, to be either sold outright or rented to applicants who comply with the requirements of the law. In this respect foreigners are not eligible, excepting those who within two years acquire Czechoslovak state citizenship; neither are persons who by the sentence of a criminal court have forfeited their municipal electoral rights, persons of depraved character, nor persons whose physical or mental disabilities render them unsuitable for engaging in agriculture (disabled ex-soldiers are excluded from the latter category, if they have a family capable of such work).

In general it may be said that the law allows a wide margin of discretion in dealing with the distribution of land. Thus, it may be assigned to individuals and associations, agricultural and co-operative societies, municipalities and other public

bodies, philanthropic or scientific institutions, as well as those serving purposes of general utility. In distributing the land among individuals, its quality and situation are to be taken into account. The area per family ranges between 6 and 15 hectares, but the allotments known as "estate remnants" will be considerably larger (about 100 hectares). The State also has the right of retaining land for its own purposes (this proviso is intended to apply especially to compact forest areas, which represent a very lucrative source of revenue).

A special law dealing with credit grants provides applicants for land with assistance, which includes an advance of 90 per cent. of the price of the land, and up to 50 per cent. of the price of the buildings or building expenses. Members of the Czechoslovak voluntary armies in the recent war (legionaries), disabled soldiers, widows and orphans of soldiers, etc., can obtain further credit grants from special funds.

These credit grants are advanced by the State through the agency of the compensatory banks. These banks collect the interest and the amortisation payments from persons to whom land has been granted, and hand over the appropriate amounts to the former owners of the land. In so doing they act as mandatories of the State, which is the debtor of the former landlord, and the creditor of the new settlers. Besides this method, the State facilitates the granting of private credit to those who acquire land, by accepting guarantees for it up to a certain amount. Working credit can also be granted by the Land Office to co-operative societies, composed of persons who have acquired land, or in the case of other societies, for those of their members who have acquired land in consequence of this legislation.

In order to carry out this land reform, a department was established, known as the Land Office, which formally inaugurated its activities on October 15, 1919. Of course at that time the conditions had not nearly reached a stage advanced enough to enable it to proceed to the practical execution of its functions. It was first necessary to promulgate the working laws for land reform, the chief of which—that dealing with compensation—was not passed until April 8, 1920. The majority of these laws also required the issue of various Government decrees, the establishment of auxiliary bodies, etc. The Land Office was unable to apply itself exclusively to this matter, as it was obliged to devote a great deal of time and energy to urgent problems arising from the restrictions on transactions

in landed property, and in this way the preparations for the actual land reform were considerably protracted.

The Land Office is subordinated to a Ministerial Council, which is presided over by a chairman and two vice-chairmen. In important matters a joint resolution is arrived at by the actual executive committee, composed of twelve members, elected by parliament for a period of three years. The Land Office has set up its district departments in the separate areas, and a group of commissaries officiates upon the larger units of landed property.

How extensive will be the activities connected with the land reform may be judged from the following figures. The area of land expropriated in accordance with the law of April 16, 1919, amounts to about five million hectares, or roughly 36 per cent. of the total area of the Czechoslovak State. Of this land, about three million hectares consist of forests, and over one million hectares of fields. The number of owners of this land does not exceed 2,000, several among whom are foreigners. The latter will be dealt with exactly as subjects of the Republic. (The law of April 16, 1919, indicated the possibility of passing a special law with regard to the confiscation of property belonging to subjects of enemy states, and members of the Habsburg-Lorraine family, etc., but this never came into force. Only Habsburg property will be liquidated on special lines, that is to say, in accordance with the provisions of the Peace Treaty of St. Germain).

So far, the results of the land reform have been comparatively insignificant. In 1919 a scheme was started for supplying small holders with land from the large estates which they had rented since 1901. This scheme, however, applied not only to the "expropriated" land, but to certain other categories, in particular to ecclesiastical landed property. The result was that about 150,000 hectares of land changed ownership. In 1920 a process was carried out known as "compulsory rental," *i.e.*, the Land Office made use of the powers conferred upon it by the law of January 30, 1920, and, in order to satisfy the most urgent requirements, directed the owners of "expropriated" land to lease out a certain smaller portion of their fields and meadows¹ to applicants whom the Land Office should recognise as suitable. This rental is only a provisional arrangement, to hold good for a maximum period of six years. Its purpose was, in the difficult

¹ It is estimated that this comprised about 15 per cent. of the arable land expropriated

period immediately following the war, to provide a means of livelihood for people who had little land of their own, or who were suffering through unemployment or unfavourable conditions in their main calling. This scheme was still being carried out during 1921 in Slovakia and Carpathian Ruthenia, while in Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia it was restricted to the "legionaries." The area of land affected by it is estimated at 120,000 hectares.

The actual distribution of the expropriated land has hitherto been carried out only in a few instances, and has then always been achieved by means of an agreement with the former owners. The compensation was paid in cash. The area of land thus taken over and distributed up to the end of 1921 amounted to about 24,000 hectares.

The progress of the land reform so far has been severely criticised. Objections have been raised to its slowness, to the lack of consideration for the interests of officials and workmen hitherto employed on the expropriated estates, and to the inadequacy of the assistance to needy applicants for land; while, on the other hand, the estate-owners are dissatisfied with the method of fixing and paying the compensation, and demand an increase in the scale for areas over 250 hectares. The organisation of the Land Office has also met with disapproval, and accordingly a number of changes will shortly be made in the legislation and administration of the land reform. This was referred to by President Masaryk in his New Year's message.

It is obvious, of course, that to carry out this huge task under conditions as unfavourable as those inherited by the young Republic from the ruins of Austria-Hungary, involved unusual difficulties. But it is to be regarded as a happy omen in this respect that the whole nation was, and still is, unanimous that this reform must be carried out, and that it must follow evolutionary lines.

JOSEPH MACEK.

THE AGRARIAN PROBLEM IN HUNGARY.

As early as 1906 the radical group connected with the sociological review *Huszadik Század* put forward the demand for Hungarian land reform in a democratic sense. The news which reached Hungary soon after with regard to Mr. Lloyd George's land projects gave a fresh incentive to the idea of reform, which gradually penetrated public opinion. During the Great War, the left wing of the Party of Independence, led by Count Michael Károlyi, adopted the same platform, and after the revolution of 31 October, 1918, attempted to realise it in conjunction with the Radical and Social Democratic Parties. It is regrettable that these projects of land reform aroused so little attention abroad: for it must be emphasised that their honest enforcement in Hungary would have materially contributed not only to the political democratisation of Hungary, but even to the economic revival of Europe. This can only be made clear by a survey of Hungarian physical conditions, the possibilities of agrarian production and their relation to the distribution of landed property.

The historical Hungary is a unitary geographical territory, sharply cut off from its surroundings—it is a basin shut in to the north-east and south-east by the high Carpathian range, to the west by the Alps, to the south-west by the Karst, and to the south by the Serbian hills. It is, however, divided by a fairly big mountain wall, pierced by two mountain valleys into two unequal parts—to the west the large Pannonian basin, to the east the smaller Transylvanian basin. The total area exceeds that of Great Britain and Ireland and contains a population of 21 millions. The mountain chain which surrounds these two basins has thick clay strata and a severe and damp climate. In the plains and hill country, which make up the centre, the soil is mainly diluvial, but its great natural fertility is diminished by a tendency towards drought. This is not due to the small amount of precipitation, as, for instance, in the steppes of South Russia. In the Carpathian basin this amounts to 500 to 700 millimetres according to the district, and the dryness is merely due to the fact that the summer is hot and long and

favours the evaporation of the natural moisture in the soil. Hence the farmer has always had to contend with drought, and this was a serious handicap to agricultural production, which in past centuries stood at a low level. It is only since the middle of the XIXth century that Hungarian agriculture has to some extent improved, but even since then the technical improvements which play such a part in the land systems of north-west Europe have only been partially and hesitatingly introduced, since they were less effective in a climate so exposed to drought as that of Hungary, than in the damper countries in which they were invented. Thus, despite undoubted progress especially between the years 1875-1895, Hungarian agriculture is still very backward. Even in the last years of peace the output per hectare on the fertile diluvial and clay lands of Hungary was 40 per cent. lower than that of German agriculture, which had to work with sandy soil and less heat in summer, but a distinctly damper climate.¹

Since the beginning of the present century, however, there has been a great change in Hungary as regards the possibilities of agricultural production. What was formerly impossible owing to natural conditions in the Carpathian basin—namely, intensive agriculture with great productivity—has rapidly become possible owing to the technical progress made all over the world during this period. Since 1900 new practical methods of working the soil were devised in America and still further perfected in Hungary, and the farmer was thus able to put his land into such condition that it would soak in rain or snow-water rapidly and thoroughly, and thus greatly reduced evaporation by simple and cheap expedients. In cultivation, too, great progress was made, which enabled the farmer to make far fuller use of heavy rainfalls. The results reached in Hungary have been specially remarkable, and in the last ten years of peace the output was increased from twice to three and a half times, merely by modern methods of cultivation and the preservation of the moisture of the soil, *without artificial irrigation*. This latter method, of course, represents a further means of increasing productivity, specially suited to the lower plains of the Carpathian basin which extend to nearly 125,000 square kilometres (31,000,000 acres) and lend themselves to irrigation methods. Here the soil is admirable, and the summer temperature is suited for the production not only of maize, soy, ramie and similar hot-country products,

¹ Germany produced 1·9 tons of corn or 13·8 tons of potatoes per hectare. Hungary only produced 1·2 tons of corn and 7·9 of potatoes.

but even rice, cotton and sweet potatoes. According to a calculation of Mr. Eugene Kvassy from the year 1906, it would be possible to divert from the rivers of the Carpathian basin, without in any way affecting the navigation, enough water to irrigate 1,250,000 catastral yokes (1,750,000 acres), and by the creation of reservoirs the volume of water available could be increased so far as to supply another 250,000 yokes. This information is incorrect, since it is based upon a volume of water of 1.4 per second and per hectare—in other words, for an irrigation season of five months a total water level of 1,350 millimetres (53 inches), a figure which was far too high for the technical attainments of 1906. Since then, however, there have been great advances in the science of irrigation. According to Professor Krüger of Berlin, the new method of “*Ackerberegnung*,” invented in Germany between 1908 and 1912, has reduced the amount of water necessary to 0.14 litre per second and per hectare. In the Carpathian basin owing to the great heat in summer 0.2 litre would probably be required, and in that case the amount of water available according to Kvassy would supply 7,500,000 yokes. This means that in the area in question no less than a million acres of extremely fruitful soil could by the aid of irrigation be submitted to the most intensive agricultural methods and produce a gigantic amount of raw material.

It must not, however, be overlooked that an extensive system of irrigation would hardly be possible in the Carpathian basin under the present conditions produced by political partition. For intensive methods of irrigation involve not only the co-operation of mountain and plain, but also of the various sections of the plain itself: and there can be no question of constructing the beginnings of a large irrigation canal, if it is to end across the frontiers of some hostile state. Consequently the schemes pre-suppose either the restoration in some form of the political unity which prevailed in this territory before 1918, or else something in the nature of a friendly confederation between the various states among whom this territory is now divided. Quite apart, however, from possibilities offered by artificial irrigation, there is still very much to be done in the way of increasing production within the Carpathian basin. The use of scientific methods of rainfall distribution might easily double the pre-war output. How much this means, is shown by the fact that in the lands of the Crown of St. Stephen the total area of arable land, meadows, gardens and vineyards (without pasture land) amounted before the war to 18,100,000 hectares (44,700,000 acres),

and that this area could easily be extended by an additional three and a half million hectares by reclaiming suitable forest land and alpine meadows, swampland, and sandy or alkaline soil.

With a few brilliant exceptions, very little advantage had been taken of these new agricultural possibilities in pre-war Hungary, although the standard of education among the Magyar, German, Slovak, and to some extent the Croat, agricultural population was sufficiently high to make such increased production practicable. The main blame for this failure rests with the aristocratic system of landownership. According to the official statistics for 1913, the total agricultural and forest area of Hungary (excluding Croatia) was divided as follows:—

Holdings of under 100 yokes, 45·6 per cent.

Holdings from 100 to 1,000 yokes, 14·4 per cent.

Holdings from 1,000 to 10,000 yokes, 19·7 per cent.

Holdings of over 10,000 yokes, 19·3 per cent.

Of the first category (peasant proprietors) about one-eighth falls to "large peasant holdings" of over 50 yokes: the small and medium peasant holdings thus only comprise 40 per cent. of the total area. The greater part of the large properties are entailed: in 1913 entailed estates made up 32 per cent. of the total area. In Croatia land distribution was similar, with this difference that the holding of the gentry (100 to 1,000 yokes) was relatively smaller, while both the large landowners and the peasants held relatively more. On the whole, distribution was more unfavourable among the Magyars than among the other nationalities.

Needless to say a decisive rôle in agricultural matters thus fell to the owners of *latifundia*, and to the large and medium proprietors who were under their influence: and these, of course, formed the ruling class in a country where industry was but little developed. Their central organisation, the Hungarian Agricultural Union (*Országos Magyar Gazdasági Egyesület* or *O.M.G.E.*) had the real control, and other farmers' organisations, and even offices of state had to follow its directions. Now these organisations had only once openly opposed the idea of increased agricultural production—this occasion being when Count Serényi was Minister of Agriculture—but in real fact they have always worked against it with all their forces. An instance of this occurred early in 1906, when the Kvassy scheme of irrigation, though favoured by public opinion, was first shelved and then slowly consigned to oblivion. Moreover since 1908 everything

was done to prevent the technical improvements already referred to from being too widely discussed in the press and elsewhere. Indeed the large landowners, with but rare exceptions, showed themselves hostile to these innovations, on the one hand owing to technical reasons connected with estate management, and also owing to the fear that improved methods of production would bring down agricultural rents.

The first of these reasons held good because technical improvements and intensive methods offered few inducements to the great *latifundia*. While in England the big properties have been split up into a number of small holdings varying from 300 to 1,000 acres and made over to individual tenants—a method which is relatively favourable to production—in Hungary even *latifundia* of 100,000 acres or more are managed as a huge concern by the proprietor himself, or at most made over to two or three tenants: they are only supplied with the most necessary buildings, and, speaking generally, not well managed. Thus technical improvements and intensive methods could only be introduced here if the whole system of management were to be radically altered, and to this the proprietors would not readily consent. Certain recent technical measures simply cannot be introduced under the system of large estates and paid labour—for instance, the “earthing up” (*Behäufelung*) of the grain according to the Demtschinsky method, which is only successful if carried out with handrakes rather than manufactured machines, and with a personal attention which can only be expected from the small-holder working his own land. In Hungary experiments in the Demtschinsky method on some small holdings led to doubling the output both of grain and of straw: but the organ of the large proprietors, *Kötelek*, rejected the system, on the ground that for its practical application “very skilful and reliable workmen” are required, and these the large proprietors of Hungary do not possess. But the main cause of their hostility lay in their anxiety as to rents, and this was not unfounded in view of the existing tariff position.

Before 1905, Austria-Hungary, as a unified customs area, exported more grain than it imported; consequently corn duties did not tend to raise the price of grain, which was not higher in Vienna and Budapest than in London. But even during the two preceding decades the surplus of corn available for export steadily diminished, owing to the natural increase of the population inside the customs area, and early in the new century the home demand accounted for nearly the whole harvest, until in 1907 the

increasing demand could no longer be met on the home market, and the permanent importation of grain became necessary. In consequence the corn duties began to affect prices, and the price of wheat, which had formerly been about 160 Kronen per ton, suddenly rose to about 240 Kronen, and remained at this level until the outbreak of war. The result was a sudden large increase of income to the large and medium landowners. The need for importing grain, however, though it had its effect upon the duties, was at first still quite small. During the five years 1909-1913 the annual average production of grain and potatoes in Austria-Hungary amounted to 27,800,000 tons. But the consumption and seed requirements only amounted in these years to an average of 28,200,000 tons, so that, on an average, only 400,000 tons required to be imported. If then production had been increased even by as little as 10 per cent. in these years, there would have been a surplus for export, the import duties would have lost their effect, the price of corn would have fallen by 30 per cent. and the rents would have been materially lowered. It is easy to understand that in these circumstances landowning organisations would not even hear of an increase in production. They had for years past longed for such a situation, which was so favourable to their own pockets. Count Stephen Tisza, who was peculiarly conscious of his interests as a member of the landowning class, had dwelt, as early as 1895,¹ upon the fact that owing to the natural increase of the population Austria-Hungary's export of corn was falling from year to year, and expressed the pious hope that in a few more years the surplus of corn for export would entirely disappear and the Monarchy would be obliged to import corn, with the result that the corn duties would force up prices. When this actually occurred in 1907, the big landowners were bent on maintaining the new position at all costs. In 1908 one of their members, Mr. Gedeon Rohonczy, openly put forward the demand for a compulsory state limitation of the production of corn in the interest of an effective protective system. He thus proclaimed protection as an aim in itself to which the interests of production must be sacrificed. This is a drastic illustration of the manner in which the agrarian protectionists of Austria-Hungary have distorted the teachings of Franz von Liszt, the apostle of the protectionist idea: for Liszt's aim was to increase production, and duties were a mere means to that end.

¹ See his pamphlet on "Hungarian Land Policy" (*Magyar Agrar-politika*).

The large landowners of Hungary and Austria, thanks to the strength of their organisation, successfully prevented the increase of agricultural production: but by so doing they committed a grave offence against the general interests of the population. For increased production would have given more bread to the hungry and greater well-being and opportunities of physical and intellectual progress for all classes. To check production and progress in their own narrow interests is the worst crime that any ruling class can commit.

After the October revolution of 1918 it seemed as though the landowning class was about to atone for its sins. Public opinion was unanimous in favour of a partition of the *latifundia*, and the change seemed inevitable in view of the upheaval in the relation between the classes, due to the sudden disappearance of the Dual Monarchy. The vast *latifundia* of Hungary were the creation of the Habsburg dynasty, whose aim it was not only to enrich its favourites and so entrench its own power, but also to extend Catholicism in Hungary, then predominantly Protestant—just as it had done in Bohemia after the battle of the White Mountain. With the fall of “Vienna” there fell also the power which made the *latifundia* of Hungary and kept them in being: and without the restoration of the Hungarian Monarchy they cannot permanently survive.

There are other reasons of a social and economic nature for the division of the great Hungarian estates. The collapse has deprived Hungary of the whole of her mountain territory, so rich in forests and minerals, and this has suddenly checked her economic development. If the little country is not to lose too many men, it must find room for its surplus population by a speedy and extensive colonisation. This surplus has been swelled still further by the numerous Hungarian refugees coming from the districts now held by Roumania, Jugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, and the great legion of disabled soldiers must also be considered. Moreover, Hungary can only recover economically and play its proper part in the reconstruction of Europe, if the great possibilities opened up for its agriculture by modern technical progress are exploited to the full, instead of being held in check as hitherto. Hence the large estates must be cut down, because they have shown themselves in matters of production to be a thoroughly reactionary force. It is, of course, true that the conditions described above, which led the large landowners to oppose production, have ceased with the collapse of the Monarchy, and the small Hungary of to-day must remain a

land of agricultural exports, whether its production increases or not. But the effects of the war have introduced a new factor, which makes economic progress distasteful to the large owners, and this lies in the problem of labour. The war has thinned the ranks of the agricultural labourers, but has produced great overcrowding in Hungarian towns: and a large proportion of this surplus came fairly recently from the country districts and would be quite glad to return to them, *but only as small proprietors and not as hired labourers*. Hence the large landowners would be faced by high wages at the very first stage of a reform in production, and since increased output in the peasant holdings would increase employment and even revive languishing industry in the towns, an early result would be a further rise in wages. Hence under present circumstances the landlord is hardly likely to abandon the resistance which he has maintained for 15 years past to increased production.

When after the revolution the discussion on land reform began, it was argued on the side of the large landowners that the maintenance of their system would not injure the interests of production, and that on the contrary subdivision into small peasant holdings was bound to reduce it still further, since, however backward methods of cultivation on the large estates of Hungary might be, they were at any rate better than on the small holdings, and that the peasant holder produced about one-seventh less per hectare than the large landowner. This argument, however, was completely refuted by the reformers, who pointed out that though the large and medium estates made up 54·4 per cent. of the total agricultural and forest land of the country, a large section of this area consisted of wood, pasture and little used sandy soil, etc., with the result that its share of cultivated land only amounted to 32·5 per cent. of the total. If, then, the output on these 32·5 per cent. is reduced by one-seventh, this means that the total harvest is only diminished by less than 5 per cent. In the event of subdivision this would, however, be made good in various ways. For instance (1) the area under cultivation could easily be increased by about 20 per cent., and, as already stated, such land is for the most part in the hands of large proprietors, and especially on entailed estates. If we reckon in these areas, the total production would rise to about 14 per cent. in the event of complete land reform, despite the inferior technical methods of the small holdings. (2) Among the small peasant holdings the so-called "small cultures"—gardens, orchards, poultry and even pigs—which on a small area produce

relatively high values, form a much higher percentage than in large holdings : consequently the splitting up of the large estates would augment the total value. (3) A well organised campaign of village instruction and demonstration and the introduction of new technical improvements on the peasant holdings could be undertaken immediately after the fall of the old system, which has hitherto obstructed such tendencies.

Meanwhile, in the period following the revolution, land reform was confronted with one great difficulty in the matter of production, and this was due to the fact that Hungary in its political and economic collapse lacked the necessary agricultural implements for the equipment of several hundred thousand new peasant holdings. For the stock of the large estates could not be employed straight away for such small holdings as might be carved out of them, both because the machinery used under the two systems is different, and because fewer machines or implements are needed in a given area under large than under small holdings. For instance, on the large estates of Hungary there is roughly one plough to 30 yokes of arable meadow land, but if those 30 yokes are to be split into three peasant holdings of 10 yokes each, two would have to be supplied with ploughs from elsewhere. Even this great difficulty might have been overcome, firstly, by showing special consideration for the claims of those diminutive holders who already possess carts and ploughs (since a peasant who has equipment for five or ten acres can manage twice as much land with the same equipment) ; and secondly (when assigning their share to former agricultural labourers) by adopting the method of parcelling out on a co-operative basis the implements and draught oxen formerly belonging to the estate. Under this scheme each individual would have the right to leave the co-operative society and start on his own land, as soon as he was able to obtain the necessary implements and live stock. He would in the meantime feel himself to be the proprietor of his own land, which would be registered in his name, and the pressure of necessity would lead to a working arrangement. Certain experiments of the Károlyi *régime* show that such a solution would have been difficult, but not impossible. It would of course have involved commandeering or purchasing outright from the former proprietor the stock in trade of the estate ; and to ensure this working smoothly, it would have been advisable to partition the entire area of the large estates.

The agrarian law drawn up by Barna Buza, Minister of

Agriculture in the Károlyi Government (Art. XVIII., 1919), did not go so far as this. It only parcels out that part of the large estates consisting of gardens, meadows and low pasture, and even of this an average of 500 yokes was left to the former proprietor—strictly speaking, in some cases more, in others less, varying indeed according to special circumstances from 2,000 to 200 yokes. Under this law, forest land and mountain pasture cannot as a rule be expropriated except where the interests of the local agricultural population urgently demand it, and then only on lines and to an extent justified by the requirements of improved production. The new holdings provided for by this law were to be nominally ten yokes in extent, and to be assigned in the main to agricultural labourers and diminutive holders, but also to other unpropertied persons who had served in the war and were physically fit for farm labour. In addition, allotments averaging three yokes in extent were assigned to disabled soldiers, war widows and orphans. The question of compensation to the expropriated owners was to have been regulated by a special law, and was keenly contested by the rival parties, who wished to fix compensation at a low or high figure according to their more or less Radical standpoint. The law contained severe and suitable measures to prevent abuses, such for instance as the assignment of new holdings to unqualified persons.

Mr. Buza's land measure undoubtedly had its good sides, and, though the result of a compromise between rival views, represented an enormous work of reform, and, if carried out, would have altered the whole aspect of the country in a democratic sense. But, like every compromise, it had its drawbacks, the chief of which fall under four heads: (1) By excluding in principle forest land and mountain pasture from expropriation it left a large area and with it large political power to the big proprietors, and thus seriously diminished the area available for subdivision. Since the Treaty of Trianon, however, this was of little practical importance, because what is left of Hungary is without mountains and so has very little forest land or mountain pasture. (2) The average area of the new holdings was fixed too low with 10 yokes, and this handicapped the whole scheme. Ten yokes of arable and meadow land would, subject to the technical improvements which could be introduced in Hungary, amply suffice to maintain a peasant family; but these improvements are still in the future. Under existing backward conditions twelve or fifteen yokes are needed to maintain a family. There

would really have been enough land available to furnish about 13 or 14 yokes per holding, if more had been expropriated from the large and medium-sized properties than had been provided for by the Buza reform. As meanwhile the labourer had only been promised ten yokes, he felt uncertain of keeping himself entirely on so small a holding, and yet saw that he would lose the employment hitherto assured to him by the big estates if they were split up. This circumstance robbed the reform movement of part of its strength, being used with propagandist effect by opponents of reform—the feudal landlords, the clericals and part of the Marxist Social Democrats. (3) A further fault of the Buza reform is that it did not simultaneously set about the redistribution (“commassation”) of existing peasant holdings, which would have been of incalculable economic advantage, in view of the scattered and complicated nature of the holdings in large village communities, and which would have resulted in every peasant having his share in a single piece or at most two pieces, and so being able to farm much better and more easily. But the idea of linking up partition and redistribution met with special opposition among the large proprietors, who also had their spokesmen among the Conservative elements of Count Károlyi’s Independent party. On former occasions, when land had been redistributed in Hungary, the large proprietors had the first word in the commissions appointed, with the result that the smallholders were generally at a disadvantage and received the less good land, while the best went to the landlords. In the winter of 1918–1919, when the power was tending to fall into the hands of the peasants, the big landlords were afraid that the opposite would occur, and that in any redistribution they would get the bad land, and smallholders the good. (4) The main defect of the Buza reform was the long delay in drafting caused by disunion among the revolutionary parties: with the result that it only began to be put into execution in March, 1919, when the days of the Károlyi Government were already numbered. Without undue haste a beginning could have been made with its execution during the winter, if the peasant masses had been properly represented in the matter. There were not lacking suggestions that land reform should be placed in the hands of a peasant Congress, but this naturally met with great opposition, neither the Socialists nor the semi-Conservatives of the Government *bloc* approving of such a step. The former, who had suddenly seized political power on 31 October and enjoyed something like a monopoly of it, were not ready to share it with peasant repre-

sentatives—even though, quite apart from democratic principles, this was demanded by reasons of expediency, since in Hungary the peasants and agricultural labourers formed two-thirds of the peasant population. The Conservative wing of the Independents, which had always been in touch with the peasant masses and therefore enjoyed a favourable position in the Government *bloc* during the early months of the revolution, was at one time nervous at the prospect of numerous peasant representatives combining with the Radical elements in the towns. Thus the attempt to assign a large part of the power and responsibility for the new order to the peasant masses was defeated. That it should come to this under the existing distribution of forces was a great political disaster; and to this it was very largely due that the elements which had made the October revolution, being at a later date without the backing of the peasant masses, inevitably went down before the Bolshevik onslaught.

At the land reform *enquête* which was held in the autumn of 1918 in the Ministry of Agriculture the large landlords were strongly represented by their best forces, whereas the peasants were only represented by a few demagogic leaders who had long since become professional politicians. It was the personal merit of the Minister Buza himself that, despite this *milieu*, he on the whole preserved the democratic character of the reform, and this was partly due also to the pressure of the Radicals and Socialists, who at the last moment concluded a compromise on the land question in a democratic sense. But in the Social Democratic party there were acute differences of opinion regarding the principles of land reform, many wishing to follow Henry George, and others favouring free small holdings as the basis of reform. In the end, after prolonged debates, the latter tendency won, being supported by the middle class revolutionary parties, and found expression in the Buza Act. But valuable time had been lost through these dissensions, and could never be made good.

Then came the collapse of the Károlyi-Berinkei Government. As a result of the territorial demands put forward at Budapest by Colonel Vyx in the name of the Allies, the working classes suddenly went over in large masses to the Communist camp. The Soviet Government which followed annulled the Buza land reform: and one of the people's commissaries afterwards publicly boasted at a meeting that the Communists had succeeded in preventing or reversing the subdivision of the large estates which had already partially begun, and that in this they had been

aided by the large proprietors, who mobilised their influence for this common aim! This is not to be regarded as a *conscious* betrayal of the people. It was not the first time that proletariat and feudalists went together. As one example among many it may be pointed out that in the Forties in England, Cobden's agitation for the Repeal of the Corn Laws was combated not only by the large proprietors, but also by the Chartist proletariat. The ideology of these two classes is in many points akin: both represent the view of what Spencer calls the "military type" as against the industrial type, resting upon economic exchange. Hence feudal militarists and Red reactionaries often combine more easily than might be imagined.

In Hungary also during the Soviet Dictatorship (March-August, 1919) there was in the land question a certain amount of co-operation between the Communists and Feudalists. The former started from the Marxist principle that large estates must be expropriated for the State and transformed into state domains under the management of state officials. Nor should it be forgotten that the Marxist fanatics relied for support of this view not only on Marx's Bible and its commentators, but also on certain phenomena in real life which had been noticed in Hungary during the winter of 1918-1919. The great difficulty of providing the new small holdings with equipment after the break-up of the big estates, became increasingly obvious as industry collapsed; nor could the Ministry of Agriculture find a satisfactory solution of the problem. As the reform was more and more delayed, the agricultural masses grew impatient: they began here and there to seize the land, and settled this problem in their own way by seizing the livestock and implements of the big estates and forming co-operative societies for their joint use. This co-operative development was not in any way inconsistent with the division of land which was the real aim of the peasants. But the Socialist leaders saw in these sporadic movements for sharing machinery and implements among the peasants a practical confirmation of their Marxist views—with the result that even a section of those Socialists who had hitherto favoured the formation of small peasant holdings, went over to the strict Marxian standpoint. This circumstance (as has been pointed out in the press by the former Commissary Sigismund Kunfi) also had its share in strengthening the Communists in the Socialist camp, and so producing the Communist revolution of 21st March, 1919.

At first the Hungarian Soviet Government expropriated all

estates over 100 yokes without compensation, or rather the existing proprietors were left with 100 yokes, and all the surplus was confiscated. On the area thus obtained it was first intended to organise workmen's supply associations, but these only existed nominally. For "in order not to endanger the harvest, the existing estate functionaries were for the most part left in their posts. They carried on the management as before, but now to the account of the State. In many cases, where the proprietor managed his own estate, he was actually left as head manager on his own expropriated estate."¹ The workmen's co-operative societies, to which the big estates were juridically made over, consisted of the former farm-servants and those free workmen who had bound themselves to put in at least 120 days' work a year on the property. Out of these members a council of management was elected, but these councils "as a rule only functioned nominally" (*formell*).² Indeed "the intended formation of councils of management on the expropriated large estates of Hungary remained for the most part on paper. If the former proprietor remained on the expropriated property as manager, appointed by the State, there was for the moment absolutely no change in a social sense. The proprietor remained in the same country-house, drove about with the same carriage-and-four, was addressed by the workmen as 'your honour.' The sole change consisted in the fact . . . that he had to follow the orders of the central management."

The consequence was that the Feudalist managers of the big estates, now "whitewashed" in red, handed over as little as possible of their produce and reckoned the rest under management expenses. On the other hand, the Soviet Government regarded the management of the big estates by workmen's co-operatives as a mere transaction leading to a complete transfer to the State. The following extract from Varga (who as President of the Communist Economic Council is a safe authority on this point) throws a glaring light upon the Communist outlook in the land question:—"The form of co-operative societies was selected owing to the social backwardness of the agricultural labourers. If we had simply proclaimed the big estates to be state property, the wage claims of the workers would have risen beyond all bounds, and the amount of work done would have

¹ Dr. Eugene Varga (a former President of the Economic Council of the Hungarian Soviet Republic), *Die Wirtschaftlichen Probleme der Proletarischen Diktatur*, page 87. Vienna, 1920.

² *Ibid.*, page 89.

dropped to a minimum. In this way there was a possibility of agitating for discipline and intensive work, *through the fact that the net profit of the property belonged to the workmen themselves.* This also to some extent satisfied the desire of the agricultural labourers to possess their own land. Politically too this seemed advisable, in order to break the force of the counter-revolutionary cry, that the agricultural workmen had only changed their master and now were merely 'the servants of the town proletariat,' instead of 'the noble Count.' *Materially this concession meant little, since the accounts of all properties were managed centrally. It was intended after a sufficient preliminary propaganda to declare the expropriated properties as state property and workmen as State employees, just in the same way as the industrial workmen.'*¹

These strange confessions of the Communist leader show that the farm-labourers were encouraged to work by the illusion that the net profits were their property, but there was also the deliberate ulterior motive of robbing the workmen of this profit by bookkeeping devices at headquarters. Varga, it is true, argues that they were forced to this deception in the interest of intensive work; but the Economic Council could have produced this in another way by dividing up the large properties in lots as the property of individual workmen. This would not have suited the aims of the Government so well, and would have been doctrinally unsound; but it would have been more honest and humane and in the end more effective. Moreover, according to Varga's admissions, the Communists, while denying the description of the workmen as mere servants of the town proletariat, definitely intended that the state should take over later on the land assigned to the co-operative societies. So gross a deception of one's class comrades involves not merely a lack of moral scruples, but also great lack of foresight; for it was absurd to suppose that in the face of desperate and active opponents they could thus fool the masses, rendered suspicious by centuries of repression.

As a natural result the Proletarian State roused the distrust of the great majority of agricultural labourers, while the small and medium peasant proprietors were no less alienated by so dishonest a policy. Their suspicions were confirmed when the Communists came out as open opponents of small peasant ownership. Béla Kun himself, at the assembly of Soviets on 21st June, 1919, incited the farm-labourers against the small proprietors. Moreover the propaganda already begun under Károlyi inside the Social Democratic party by adherents of Henry George still

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 88-9. The italics are not in the original.

continued, and the idea was not only to convert the big estates into state domains, but also to impose the land-value tax on peasant properties and so to extend ground rents everywhere. Varga (page 124-128) recommends the Proletarian State not only to impose on peasant property "a land-value tax absorbing the whole net ground rent," but also to reckon against the peasants at high prices such indispensable things as salt, oil, iron, implements and machines. The Hungarian Soviet Dictatorship owes its really miserable failure only partially to its corruption and excesses, which have often been exaggerated. The foremost cause was that it aroused by every possible means the hostility of the great majority of the agricultural population, and this proved fatal to its food policy and also in other respects. The Communist experiment would in any case have failed owing to its internal weaknesses, especially in the matter of workmen's discipline, but it need not have left such a hateful memory behind it and injured so gravely the whole cause of progress, if the Soviet Government had pursued a less doctrinaire and dishonourable agrarian policy. The net balance of this policy can be summed up in a sentence: it robbed the land population of the land which the revolution had promised it, and it saved the system of *latifundia*. For, naturally, the big landowners, as soon as the counter-revolutionary troops had entered, resumed the land which the Soviet Government had saved from subdivision, and put an end to the wretched farce of the workmen's co-operative societies.

The reaction which has prevailed in Hungary since August, 1919, is essentially the work of the big proprietors whom the Soviet Government saved. The clerical associations and the troops of the White Terror are partly financed by the big landlords. Never could reaction, much less White Terrorism, have asserted itself in Hungary, if the Communists had not frustrated Károlyi's scheme of partition into peasant holdings. The victims of the Red Terror, according to an official statement, amount to about 300; but those of the White Terror are estimated at 6,000. These atrocities must not be placed to the account of the Hungarian people as a whole, which is naturally kindly and humane; they are mainly the work of the Hungarian "gentry" class, which is both economically and politically in decay, and which contains within it elements sufficiently corrupt and demoralised to employ such methods to prop up their traditional *régime*.

The gentry class sprang originally from the lower and middle

nobility, but has during the last two centuries absorbed many alien elements—especially big proprietors and intellectuals of bourgeois or peasant origin—while, on the other hand, considerable sections of the lower nobility have lost caste and been assimilated in the peasant masses. The political ideal of the Hungarian nobility has always been the Carpathian basin as an independent political unit under the Crown of St. Stephen—the two symbols of this being the kingly office and the rule of the nobility. But since the accession of the Habsburgs, who pursued directly contrary aims, it has often been forced into a betrayal of this ideal, and this has had a demoralising effect. While the magnates in the majority of cases entered the Habsburg service, the middle and lower nobility did not unreservedly follow their example, and clung to its own national ideals in the face of the centralist, Germanising and Catholicising tendencies of the Vienna Court. Meanwhile the Habsburgs and their supporters pursued for centuries the policy of frowning on those nobles who held firmly to Protestantism and the ideals of their class, and of showering favours upon pliant and opportunist elements. Thus from 1526 right on to 1914 they pursued among the nobility and gentry of Hungary a policy of systematic selection in favour of lack of principle and corruption, and this was not without its effects. For though the Hungarian nobility at first stood high, both intellectually and morally, and in the xixth century still gave to Hungary many good brains and noble characters, the general *morale* of the class was undermined; *arrivisme* was rampant; idealism disappeared, but was not replaced by bourgeois habits of industry; and sport, wine and cards took the first place.

Thanks to this progressive moral decay the lower and middle nobility lacked the power to maintain its land, fertile though it was; its superficial and easy-going attitude led it to squander its once extensive estates, which were absorbed by the *latifundia*, and, since the emancipation of the peasants, to a certain extent by peasant holdings also. At the outbreak of war the estates between 100 and 1,000 yokes only made up 14 per cent. of the total area, and even of this the greater part was not in noble hands. The lower and middle nobility having lost its lands, tried to get a foothold in the public offices, which were quite unnecessarily multiplied for its benefit, especially in the Seventies. It filled the ranks of officers in the Hungarian Honvéd Army, it supplied the country with a large part of its numerous and corrupt advocates and professional politicians, and a good proportion of the officials and directors of the usurious provincial savings

banks. In the last few decades sons of the Hungarian gentry class began to enter the Joint Austro-Hungarian army also in large numbers, and latterly formed a large proportion of the professional officers. The gentry class held a dominant position in the life of the State, and, having lost most of its own property, really, did the political business of the *latifundia* owners.

Then came the collapse of the Dual Monarchy. In the partition more than two-thirds of the total area of the former Hungary (without Croatia) were lost; and in the public offices of the lost territories the members of the Hungarian gentry no longer have any place. The Joint Army was dissolved, and so the professional officers lost their posts. The unpropertied gentry class has to a large extent lost its means of subsistence. During the October revolution and under the Soviet Republic it was helpless to prevent this, but after the latter's collapse the officials and officers who had lost their position put forward the demand that they should be supported by the state. They armed themselves and enforced their demand as a "National Army" and as a "Union of Awakening Magyars" by armed terror. This is the meaning of the Horthy system, which belongs entirely to the Middle Ages, since there is no other modern example of a nation being treated by its noble class as an object of taxation, and the maintenance of the "noble class" being put forward as an aim in itself.

This situation naturally had its effects on land reform. The gentry class, for the most part deprived of its old means of existence, originally had the choice of uniting with the big landlords or with the peasant class. The latter alliance would have been difficult, for the peasants, with the Jewish bourgeoisie and the town workmen, provide the taxation which is to maintain the numerous but superfluous army of gentry officers and public officials. To join the peasants in seizing the *latifundia* and share their division, would be a bad bargain for the gentry class. Being very numerous, it could not hope for very much land, if it is to share with the peasants: it could not have enough to live upon without working, and many of its members object to insulting the memory of their noble ancestors by manual labour. Besides a close league with the "stinking peasant," as he is known to the gentry tradition, goes much against the grain of the ruling class: nor on the other hand have the land population sufficient trust in the class which has dominated their fathers for centuries. Thus there was nothing for the decaying gentry but a return to the pre-revolutionary alliance with

the large landlords, who would need a Prætorian army against the peasantry who are still bent on land reform. Many still hug the illusion that the old conditions can be upheld and that the gentry can continue to manage the political and military affairs of the magnates. This would, it is true, involve the restoration of the old Austria-Hungary under the Habsburgs, and this is in effect the final goal to which the Horthy system logically leads.

Meanwhile the peasants demand land reform, but it is clear that a system resting on the alliance which we have described cannot allow any reform which might not suit the big landowners. The Government brought in a land reform bill in Parliament, to save appearances; but its provisions are a reform merely in name, and tend to strengthen rather than to weaken the position of the big landlords. In the law voted in the autumn of 1920, expropriation of the big estates was abandoned, even as regards those portions of the *latifundia* which are not at present under cultivation. On the other hand, all properties which were bought during the war, whether they belonged to the category of large, medium or small holdings, were expropriated forthwith. These properties, so far as they belonged to the first two categories, were in fact mainly acquired by war profiteers; but in the third case they belong mainly to peasants, who can now be expropriated. The remainder of the area intended for subdivision is to be acquired by the Government by free purchase. In this way communal property in particular is to be acquired; and this can be done at a relatively low price in cases where the Government is able to exercise pressure. In other cases of purchase the price tends to be very high, owing to the generally prevailing corruption, which is specially marked in the case of official purchases of land. Consequently the subdivision of land cannot be carried out on a large scale, in view of the bad financial position of the state and of the landless applicants; nor would a partition of the state domains help much, as they only form a small proportion of the whole.

The land acquired by the state is to be divided as follows :—

- (1) Disabled soldiers, war widows and orphans, so far as they belong to the peasant class, can obtain a house and a plot of land.
- (2) Agricultural labourers, especially if they held medals for bravery, may obtain three yokes of land, in so far as it is available for division.
- (3) Public officials, preferably soldiers and officers, and in certain cases meritorious farm managers, can obtain small or medium holdings. Thus, the law aims at (1) giving a small dole to the victims of the war, if they belong to the agricultural

class; (2) securing small allotments to a limited number of agricultural labourers (three acres and a cow)—only just big enough to tie them to the neighbourhood of the big estate which they supply with labour; and (3) to supply a small number of adherents of the Government with a small holding, or, in the case of members of the gentry class, with a lower category of medium holdings. This is to be done chiefly at the expense of the communes, whose land was in many cases hitherto let out to the smallest class of tenants, but may now be acquired under the Act and perhaps converted into a medium holding for some ex-officer or official. Thus the Horthy reform may become a medium for peasant eviction.

Nothing shows so well its feudal character as the provision that owners of the new peasant or medium holdings enjoy certain privileges, and are consequently liable to military service "if social order is threatened." The Ministerial decree (No. 6,050), published in August, 1920, in the official gazette, *Budapesti Közlöny*, says:—"Recognised patriots who have distinguished themselves in the war will receive from the hands of the Chief of State, Governor Nicholas Horthy de Nagybánya, a grant of small holdings for the most part, but in some cases also a lesser manorial estate."¹ "The land received in fief is a reward for valour in the war," but everyone who receives land "must always be ready for such public services as aim at protecting social order and social peace." Those receiving such grants obtain all the privileges of entail: their land cannot, therefore, be alienated, and will be inherited undivided by the eldest male survivor. In addition to this they also receive exemption from taxation, and the further privilege that their land cannot be mortgaged. Such proprietors are allowed to add to their name the hereditary predicate of *Vitéz* (which means "the brave," or, in old parlance, the equivalent of knight). Thus the effect of the Horthy land reform is to create a new armed nobility. Fortunately this reversion to the middle ages can only take place on a very small scale, because the depletion of the treasury and the interests of the big landlords do not permit of large purchases of land—except in so far as the State lays its hands upon the communal land.

Although this counter-revolutionary land reform came into force toward the end of 1920, its execution has hitherto been delayed. This is due to the owners of the *Latifundia*, who prefer

¹ Something more or less equivalent to the German *Rittergut*.

the *status quo* even to a reform so favourable to their interests. In the late Parliament it was only the party of the so-called Small Farmers which insisted upon its execution. The reader must not be misled by the name of this party, which consists of members of the gentry class, led by trusty representatives of the interests of the large landowners: real peasants are only a small minority in it. It is to be hoped that the execution of this law, which would hinder rather than assist the country's productivity, will be delayed still further, in which case it may never become a reality. The Horthy system contains within itself the seeds of death. The task of maintaining according to their class standards an entirely unproductive ruling class, consisting of about 150,000 officers and officials, with their families, is too much for a small country of 7,500,000 inhabitants—especially in so serious a financial position as is that of Hungary to-day.

Heavy taxation of the peasantry would create a dangerous atmosphere for the existing *régime*, which can, therefore, only be maintained by shifting the incidence of taxation upon the middle class, which is to a large extent Jewish. This in turn means financial exploitation and is ruinous to industry and trade. The poorer the treasury becomes, the less money will the decaying gentry obtain from the state, and the more numerous will become the robber bands of ex-officers and "Awakening Magyars," who plunder and even murder wealthy Jewish merchants and manufacturers—as in the Landau case and other cases which have been kept from the ears of the foreign public. The Horthy system threatens to dissolve in brute force and robbery under arms, unless ended by some favourable conjuncture of circumstances.

The full possibilities of production in the Carpathian basin can only be realised when the power of the big landowning class has been reduced to due proportions, and when the full national freedom assured by the terms of the Trianon Treaty to all minorities in the new States has been made a reality. Only then can the peoples who inhabit the former Hungary lay aside their national hates and co-operate in tasks of peace and culture.

ARNOLD DÁNIEL.

AT THE FEAST OF THE GODS:

CONTEMPORARY DIALOGUES.¹

DRAMATIS PERSONÆ.

A PUBLIC MAN.

A GENERAL.

A DIPLOMAT.

A WELL-KNOWN AUTHOR.

A RELIGIOUS THINKER.

A REFUGEE.

DIALOGUE THE FIRST.

O Russia, now forget thy former glory,
Thy double-headed eagle lieth low.

V. SOLOVYEV.

Avaunt and vanish into space,
Russia, my Russia!

ANDREY BELY.

DIPLOMAT: I often recall two of our previous meetings. When I saw you at Lemberg, in the height of our Galician advance, you were full of enthusiasm and spoke about the Nike of Samothrace, of whirlwinds of joy and storms of victory.

PUBLIC MAN: Oh, I remember well enough, but should be glad to forget.

DIPLOMAT: Later we met again here, in Moscow, during the very first days of the 'revolution. You spoke of Dionysos the Beneficent treading the Russian plain, of a bloodless revolution, a new era, Slavonic renaissance.

PUBLIC MAN: Perished! Destroyed! All is dead, and we are dead; we wander about, dead souls in living bodies. I cannot take it in, my mind does not fathom it. The mighty State, a mainstay to friends and a terror to foes, is now mere stinking carrion, and lump after lump crumbles away to the delight of swooping vultures. The sixth part of the world has become a gaping foul pit. Where is the generous, serene nation, lovable in its kindness and childlike faith, cleverness and humility? It is now a gang of murderous robbers and traitors, steeped in filth

¹ Written in 1918, before the Armistice of 11 November. It appears to have been already published in German.—Ed.

and gore, vileness and brutality. A black transfiguration has taken place, the people of God are changed into Gadarene swine.

DIPLOMAT : But you were quite as vehement on Nike and Dionysos. Now, obviously, Circe has appeared and transformed the Dionysiac citizens into swine.

PUBLIC MAN : I cannot realise it. I fear I shall go mad. But then, I no longer fear anything . . .

DIPLOMAT : Indeed ?

PUBLIC MAN : Life has lost its zest : the sun is dim, the birds silent. Poisonous fumes and a blood-stained mist enshroud the world. Night brings oblivion, but awakening—such gloomy anguish, that the only wish left is to vanish out of this best of worlds—to see, to know, to feel no longer . . . I remember, when bowed down by great sorrow, how terrible it used to be to wake at morning and realise again the irreparable loss. But then my soul rose on wings, illumined by a gladness not of this earth. There is no comfort anywhere now ; my heart is dying, and this is truly death eternal, with its worm that never sleeps. How to stand firm ? How understand ? Why was it ordained that I should survive Russia ? Why could not I have died whilst my country still existed, like my happy friends whom God has taken ? One strain echoes in my mind :

O ! enviable fate in these base times
Neither to feel nor live ; slumber is good,
Still better the oblivion of a stone.

DIPLOMAT : Russian hysterics ! Can't you clench your teeth and suffer silently, without weeping into your neighbour's waistcoat ? And if you can stand it no longer, snap your fingers in the face of the world, fall on your sword and die like the last of the Romans. These ecstasies of grief and assertions of *tedium vite* are not convincing : " An indecent lust of life," a " Karamasov depth of vileness " break through them. And, after all, love of life is ever blind and irresponsible. Now that Russia is no more and Bolsheviks rule over us, we still cling to life and do our utmost to preserve it by doles of husks that pass for bread. We get on quite well without Russia, but we find it hard to exist without bread and sugar. Fine fellows the Marxists—they go straight at facts, while we are devoured by words ; we shall argue on our deathbeds.

AUTHOR : Excuse me, but I cannot agree with your intellectual Bolshevism : it is neither generous nor even civilised. And, after all, it is a common sorrow. We are all stunned by this catastrophe : Atlantis vanishing once more into chaos, our continent

suddenly effaced from the chart of history. How wild seemed but yesterday the poet's cry :

" Avaunt, and vanish into space,
Russia, my Russia ! "

and Russia has just gone and vanished, and in her place traitorous " self-determinationists," sneaking goblins, grovel about. Look, we are burying Russia.

DIPLOMAT : I dislike lamentations and am not good at expressing my feelings. To be frank, the pain is too deep for words. If I could weep, I should have shed all my tears four years ago, when the great conflagration started. I at once realised the cost of the war, not for my country alone, but for the whole of that European world, which I value more, as I openly and proudly acknowledge, than Russia herself. As for Russia, it seemed truly preposterous that a semi-barbaric, badly governed, economically backward nation should emerge victorious out of a conflict with the most powerful of all civilised States. My only hope, founded on the support of our more civilised Allies, waned as early as 1915, when it became obvious that our Allies were doomed to be behind-hand in everything owing to the democratic irresolution they were affected with. It is yourselves I have long wanted to ask : had your friends lost their sense and their reason when, waving aside actual stern facts, they began to spout wordy volcanoes on the liberating mission of Russia, on Tsargrad and the Cross over St. Sophia ? What fit of frenzy prompted them to drag all those old Slavophil rags out of their camphor wrappings ? Were you blind ? You curse and moan now that these childish dreams have failed, but you are compelled to accept the impartial verdict of history. And, as far as we can see, it is not your sentimental illusions, but Germany, and even Bolshevism, that history is inclined to favour. Forgive my abruptness, but we are too far gone for mere courtesies.

PUBLIC MAN : I confess I myself am now amazed at our state of mind in 1914 ; one could almost think that the change in the political barometer had turned our heads and provoked a general madness. I often wonder at it when I see how artists and poets are now captured by the onslaught of Bolshevism and slavishly surrender without seeming to realise their ambiguous position. But you must admit that the whole world was infected by Messianic ideas at that time, and who could have expected our " femininity " to withstand them ?

AUTHOR : I cannot admit such self-aspersions. I, for one, am willing to render account of every word I wrote and

said at the time. I am convinced, moreover, that I shall not stand alone, but shall be surrounded by a "cloud of witnesses"; from Pushkin and Tyutchev to Dostoyevsky and V. Solovyev. Supported by these men of divine wisdom, I defy the scorpions of your irony. Well, well. It is now the heyday of the spiteful "I told you so," but you are a little premature about the final verdict of history. I believe as before that Russia is called to make manifest to the world a new form of catholic social life, and its birth-hour *may* have struck in 1914. Further, I do not renounce the idea that participation in the world war *might* have meant the rendering of a great service to humanity, the opening up of a new era in Russian and universal history—the Byzantine era. But this certainly presupposed the expulsion of the Turks from Europe and a Russian Tsargrad, as Tyutchev and Dostoyevsky had already pointed out . . .

PUBLIC MAN : But what did happen ?

AUTHOR : This : Russia was disloyal to her mission, therefore unworthy of it, and fell ; and her fall was as great as her call had been. What we see to-day can be likened to the negative of a Russian positive : instead of a catholic œcumenical humanity—a proletarian international and a "federative" republic. Russia turned traitor to herself, but she might have acted otherwise. Nations as well as individuals are free to fulfil or discard their appointed task. Grace is not compulsory, although God is not mocked with impunity. Consequently, shortcomings and other possibilities must be taken into account. You know how interested S. W. Kovalevskaya¹ was in the question, and the way she expressed her difficulties by means of a twofold drama "What might have been" and "What has happened." In both plays the characters are the same, only their fate differs. The fate of Russia can be compared to that twofold drama : we are now going through the dreary "What has happened," but then it was our duty to think of "What might have been."

DIPLOMAT : Our misfortune lies precisely in the fact that for more than a century the best men, the thinkers of Russia, have been busily fashioning fantastical chimeras out of a supposed national feeling and then laying the blame of their failure on the people. Don't you see that you merely slander and revile your own people by crediting them with your dreams ? They clamour for land—you promise Byzantium and the Cross on St. Sophia ; they want to get home to their wives—you urge war till victory.

¹ S. W. Kovalevskaya was a well-known and, in her time, influential Liberal writer of the second half of the 19th century.

Glance at the book you love to quote : " Ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers." The Bolsheviks are more honest ; they approach the people with a simple motto : " Gorge." And the people follow their call because they promise fatness and not the Cross over St. Sophia.

AUTHOR : In this time of general " gorging " the day is yours. But where was your scepticism when Russia was fired by enthusiasm, in those unforgettable Moscow and Petrograd days ?

DIPLOMAT : Ah, well, the secret springs of all those pageants have been laid bare since then, as also various other matters relating to the beginnings of the war.

AUTHOR : But call to mind the early stages of the war : our victory in Galicia, the *morale* of the troops, obvious even to us in our wounded men, the general enthusiasm. Make an effort, rise above the contemplation of present day vileness, and mentally follow the main road history had then marked. Where does it lead ? We were on the eve of an advance on Byzantium, and that advance comprised a historical programme, it was a cultural symbol. However, " *Nessun maggior dolore* " . . . Will you deny that a nation has the choice of one among several possible alternatives, just as the national soul holds two extremes : a good and an evil one ? In its highest consciousness, a nation is the body of the church, a race of saints, a kingly priesthood ; but if it falls, it turns into the revolutionary rabble, which, drunk on some alcohol of Rousseau's or Marx's brand, rushes after a red flag and bawls : " Forward." Would you deny that before this revolution our people were indeed pious and single-minded, splendid and self-sacrificing ? Would you ?

DIPLOMAT : In a certain sense I would not.

AUTHOR : And if not, you must also allow that such a people are worthy of the mission their prophets have indicated—not by any means as a privilege, but as a heavy responsibility. Therefore, and at any cost, we are bound to remain true to our national ideal and also to our own holy of holies in these gloomy days. Let my right hand forget her cunning, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth if I remember thee not, Jerusalem, if I blaspheme and debase myself by Bolshevism.

DIPLOMAT : Wait a moment, what you in your irony call degradation is nothing but a further stage of the universal massacre in which you distinguish right and left, good and evil. To my mind, no considerations can justify this terrible disaster. The uttermost I am able to do is to bow my head before it, as

before inevitable disease and death. I am ashamed to reveal my weakness—but the most practical men have occasionally fallen a prey to sentiment and even superstition—and so my heart is in mourning since 1914, when European civilisation, my *alma mater*, burst into flames and spread the fire to our straw-thatched Russia. Different customs and ways of life made it formerly possible for war to be almost part of the daily routine: nations exterminated each other for the glory of God. But in the case of present-day Europe, war is intolerable and criminal, it is an abomination unto the Lord, and I see no glimmer of light in the general folly and prostration.

AUTHOR: So you think that Europe, suffocating under capitalistic barbarity and the burden of militarism, was spiritually healthier than it is, now that the purifying storm has burst? Your Europe was merely a thrifty shopkeeper who had accumulated sufficient wealth to have a little enjoyment. For example, take the European watering-places and all the petty haggling and petty achievements of small souls, the small change into which Europe had run. Personally, I confess I have not ventured to go abroad for the last fifteen years, for fear of poisoning myself with European comfort. It imperils one's faith.

DIPLOMAT: This is frank indeed, although I am rather at a loss to apply your words. As Jesus son of Sirach has it: "The ungodly fleeth when no man pursueth him." Might not the fear of danger have blinded you to aught beyond that shopkeeper's mentality in which we, at any rate, are as proficient as the West? Some of your spiritual predecessors elected to reside in Europe with the special object of accumulating inverted proofs of their tenets. They used that vantage-ground to deduce truth and fiction about Russian Socialism and the Russian Christ. Let us again be frank: Tyutchev¹ felt happier in the Russian Legation at Munich than in his "native land of patient pain," or "places homelike yet not loved." What would have become of our Slavophil tendencies had there been no Europe to set them off? I sometimes fancy that our emigrants are chiefly responsible for them.

AUTHOR: And in spite of all this I insist that Europe was spiritually death-stricken on the eve of the war, and that now anything will be better than the *status quo*. I hanker after no restoration whatever, least of all a spiritual one.

¹ Tyutchev—one of Russia's greatest poets and one of the oldest Slavophiles. In spite of the perfection of his Russian verse, his prose essays are written in French, which was the language he currently used.

DIPLOMAT : Still, even a bad peace is better than good fighting ; I look at the cripples, widows and orphans who bear the brunt of the war, and I ask you again : how could you and your friends let yourselves be carried away by the martial frenzy—alas ! a wordy one only !—that prompted you to glorify the world-mass-acre ? Speaking as is your custom—shared by so many—in the name of the silent nation you endowed it with an uncontrollable wish to destroy the vampire, the German man-god, and to raise the Cross on St. Sophia ; but when the people found their voice they soon showed what they thought of the vampire and St. Sophia.

AUTHOR : Must you really hark back to those mouldy pacifist contentions of Dostoyevsky, Solovyev, Tolstoy and others ? Leave all that vegetarian bigotry to the care of dense and short-sighted Tolstoyans, who are now supported by revolutionary, bloodstained pacifists ; I, for one, should be delighted to kiss the hands of a fighting officer and cannot abide the sight of these Socialist Janissaries, Red legions and dry-land sailors.

DIPLOMAT : However, you are compelled to admit this aspect of the people, whose name, as you say, is legion. Our undoing lay in the jingoism which affected public opinion in Europe also, and created an atmosphere that made a speedy end to the war impossible. It was this state of mind and the lack of independence shown by our public opinion, that made us miss the natural opportunity of making an effort towards peace at the beginning of the revolution. And how many evils would have been averted had we at once raised the question !

AUTHOR : Now that the war has ended badly, it is easy to locate the blame.

DIPLOMAT : Please, allow me to finish. As you gather, I am no champion of pacifism, and have no intention of playing Ivan the Fool : when assaulted, I strike back. I go even further : if any spoils of war may reasonably benefit your country, take all you can get without seeking justification in "historical missions." Don't pretend you are lambs when fighting like wolves. The Bosphorus has always been a tempting morsel for us and, at one time, Galicia too. Others—of your party chiefly—dreamt of still greater achievements,—that peace should be signed at Vienna or Berlin after our gallant Cossacks had tramped over the enemy's land. What bitter and humiliating feelings these aspirations now call forth ! Our trials have taught us something after all. Well—all these ambitions are wolfish ones—a Leviathan is always a Leviathan.

The Germans are now busy swallowing bits of Russian territory and do not know where to stop . . . But you, hypocritically and profanely have wreathed the iron chain in roses and set a cross above it. The present-day methods are more like yours than would appear at first sight; we are not simply robbed of our possessions, but they are requisitioned in the name of the socialist creed, which many do profess sincerely, not out of covetousness or rapacity.

AUTHOR: I fear neither your sentimentality nor your sarcasm. A great historical mission may be superficially compared to a crazy dream. But the whole history of Russia tells us that "Constantinople must be ours." Also, history is not made by white-gloved schoolmasters: kingdoms rise and fall in the midst of earthquakes, to the thunder of battle-fields. And when the earth began to shake, when we were drawn into war with Turkey, those who had eyes saw clearly enough that for us the point at issue was Tsargrad, just as they had previously seen in Byzantium the sacred symbol of a new era of our history. It is not for us to know times or seasons, but neither is it for us to cavil at them. Therefore, the resignation which vented itself in discussions as to whether we boors could be deemed worthy to raise the cross over St. Sophia before we had closed our public-houses and emancipated the Jews, meant nothing to me but feeble irresolution and cowardice . . .

DIPLOMAT: I hope resignation means more to you at present.

AUTHOR: Not at all. The hysterical softness which always succumbs to brute force does not appeal to me. On the contrary, I am inclined to think that Russia is spiritually poisoned through having discarded her historical duty. Just mark the altered looks of soldiers and sailors; they are now bestial, hideous, especially the latter, and the whole lot of "comrades" seem devoid of souls and dominated by lower instincts only, like a kind of Darwinian ape—*homus socialisticus*.

REFUGEE: A. N. Schmidt, in 1848, notes the appearance of such soulless beings in her memoirs. She thinks it is a prelude to the coming of the Antichrist. I too have been struck by this likeness to antediluvian humanity.

DIPLOMAT: And quite lately you were ready to kneel before a soldier's grey cloak! What an aristocratic, undignified way of regarding the people: crusaders to-day and brutes to-morrow! While they are really mere ignorant men who have been forcibly led to the slaughter, stood it at first, were rewarded with full marks, and afterwards lost their temper,

"self-determined themselves," and showed their innate ruthlessness. Crusaders indeed! you can't get over that official lie, which is as fulsome as the flattery strewn nowadays by official scribes before proletarian potentates. How could a crusade even be mentioned in this era of ours?

AUTHOR: Now, unfortunately, it is out of the question, as our nation has been worshipping a red rag and a golden calf, or, to be exact, the paper image of one. But so long as the people considered themselves Orthodox, it was our duty to speak of a crusade.

DIPLOMAT: Excuse me—it was exceptionally blasphemous just then. Religious feelings evolve and grow; a crusade would now be accounted rank "imperialism," or even mere coveteousness masquerading under honourable motives. I never expected that our Slavophiles would admit such a free translation of their romantic dreams into imperialistic terms. I thought they looked forward to the conquest of Tsargrad not as a result of war and bloodshed, but as the consequence of a peaceful Pan-slavonic union; in short, as to a naturally ripening fruit of history. I surmise that even now such a prospect is not entirely lost, although indefinitely postponed. At any rate, the Gods have preserved us from the sorry fate of entering Constantinople under the select and famous Russians who surrounded the Throne these latter years, and from getting ourselves universally abhorred. By the way, don't you think the Bolsheviks are suffering from the same mental twist when they capture a Russian town by fire and sword and declare it to be forthwith included in the socialistic paradise—until they are ejected?

AUTHOR: Once more your sarcasm comes back on yourself and is a lapse of form. But I still insist that we must take Tsargrad to begin a new Byzantine era, just as the St. Petersburg era dates from the foundation of St. Petersburg. History advances impulsively, by jolts and starts.

DIPLOMAT: And nature is evolutionary; *Natura non fecit saltus*, or, in good Russian, every vegetable has its season. But, say what you please, that Neo-Byzanticism is branded with exaggerations and self-deceptions that veil "annexations and contributions." The politicians who simply declared that Russia required the Straits were more frank and honest. If I were you, I should handle sacred symbols with greater care and try to keep them clean. Can you honestly nowadays think of your Tsargrad dreams without blushing?

AUTHOR: I am true to them now and for ever. Russia has played false to her mission and sold her birthright for a mess of pottage, which, thank Heaven, she never got . . . However, the ways of history are inscrutable and it is not easy to fathom the wisdom of the Directing Mind. Perhaps the mission entrusted to Russian arms has now devolved on German ones.

PUBLIC MAN: What do you mean?

AUTHOR: I mean that, by wrenching the south of Russia away, the Germans more effectually direct the course of Slav streams into the Russian sea than we ever did. The natural sequence of events will accomplish the rest, and, after throwing off Teutonic supremacy, united Slavdom will roll on to Constantinople. So the prophesy of Tyutchev will come true, in spite of your premature sarcasm.

DIPLOMAT: Baneful ideology! Russian dreams which merely seek a refuge from bitter reality! This war admits of no ideology whatever. At first the war seemed to contain elements of justice: self-defence, protection of the Slavs (blast them!), vindication of liberty. This enthusiasm was naturally bound to exhaust itself in the course of two or three months, and please to observe that all Europe, which was then still clear-headed, never expected the war to outlast that term. But when it overstepped all its limits, the war began to rot and became an awful source of demoralisation and obduracy. The character of the war was now marked by a striving after gain or extermination, and Europe had lost its head. Even the Russian revolution at first changed nothing in the predatory massacre, the revolution was on its best behaviour before the Allies; it lisped helplessly: "War until victory," secretly hoped to obtain Constantinople and added in the same breath "No annexations or contributions." And these incongruities dragged on until the Bolsheviks cut the knot. In their directness, which means nothing to you but disloyalty and scandal, the honest soul of Russia, unbiassed by any international muddle, found its expression.

AUTHOR: Now you again side with those Bolsheviks who, after parading as peace-makers before a formidable foe, set out to exterminate disarmed citizens. I like the honest soul in this cynical revelation of shamelessness!

DIPLOMAT: But don't you realise that Bolshevism is the direct inheritance and continuation of the war, an internal rot. Bolshevism is the strongest proof of the evil influence of the war. dreams of a Byzantine era have led to civil strife

and social tyranny; marauding in an enemy's country—to marauding at home. And the fact that we, heroes of the rear, are made to pay for our safe and honourable places as spectators at the world-war by experiencing its horrors on our persons, contains elements of stern justice. The nightmares of Bolshevism we have been through make one rather ashamed of former dreams of conquest, that meant subjecting an enemy's defenceless population to the rapacity of brutal soldiers and all sorts of bolsheviks. In Russia all this militarism and every kind of savagery are now declared to be Socialism and termed "the dictatorship of the proletariat;" but Europe is as much to blame for the existence of the species and will not escape her punishment in the guise of European Bolshevism. The Bolsheviks are quite right in looking forward to their day, although they may be mistaken as to the date, which is all-important for them. Truth will out: it is after all mankind who is rebelling, under a Bolshevik's bestial semblance, against the universal cult of militarism.

REFUGEE: There is a good deal in your remark. It is not by a mere chance that Bolshevism appeared in Russia first. Indubitably our nation, economically the weakest, was least apt to bear the military strain, but over and above that, it is less corrupt and of purer blood. And we know the havoc syphilis and alcohol produce among savages, not because the latter are worse than civilised nations, who have to a certain degree adapted themselves, but just because savage blood is purer. Thank God that the Russian soul has not borne with militarism. Would you, indeed, have liked to see a Russian soldier turned into the military doll that is flung from one front to another to lay down its bones for new markets for the Vaterland? Is not this "Deutsche" Treue rather a distortion of the real thing? Our people positively dislike war.

DIPLOMAT: In any case they prefer war against their own officers and unarmed inhabitants to war with an armed foe. I see nothing to admire either in the Huns or in nomad tribes. Curious, how the Bolshevik yoke has affected the passive citizen's relation to Germans: chauvinists of yesterday now yearn for Germans to come and save them. See how Pro-Germanism is gaining ground!

PUBLIC MAN: That is unfortunately so; the instinct of self-preservation blunts every other feeling. Bolshevism has made "bourgeois" of us all; it has stimulated the spirit it set out to crush. Bolshevism in itself is the expression of bourgeois

tendencies in the proletarian who has bagged a place at the feast of life and put his feet on the table. The rest, cowed by terror and longing for peace and public security—and who can blame them?—hanker after a Teutonic Guardian-angel of bourgeois order. Russia is literally suffocating with bourgeois feelings under the heel of the beast. It is dreary and revolting.

DIPLOMAT: Sublime feelings so easily cowed by fear do not seem quite genuine. And the present “wrath of the people,” as well as its former manifestation in the Pugachev upheaval, may contain elements of deep-lying truth. I certainly look on Socialism as an obtuse and naïve prejudice, but when I think of the orgy of greed that possessed our Minins and Pozharskys¹ on the eve of the revolution I cannot refrain from a feeling of satisfaction. Serve them right! No awakening of the masses will ever suit them . . . Also the people are now receiving fair compensation for the hardships of the war . . . And here is the moral of it all: thanks to the war, a Bolshevik period of Russian history has begun, instead of the Byzantine era.

SERGIUS BULGAKOV.

¹ Minin, a merchant of Nizhny-Novgorod, who, together with Prince Pozharsky, first appealed to national patriotism and, raising money and troops, organised forces to combat the victorious Poles and the internal anarchy of the Time of Troubles that began after the death of Tsar Boris Godunov and lasted until the election of Michael Fedorovich Romanov to the throne in 1613.

THE DYING REPUBLIC.

(Translated from the Serbo-Croat of COUNT IVO VOJNOVIĆ, by
FANNY S. COPELAND.)

[*Dubrovačka Trilogija* (The Ragusan Trilogy), of which we here publish the first act, is the best known work of the Yugoslav poet and dramatist Count Ivo Vojnović, himself a member of an ancient Dalmatian family. His theme is the little Slav Republic of Dubrovnik, which, under the more familiar name of Ragusa, has passed into the English language in the word "argosy." First founded by refugees from the sack of Greek Epidauron, it led a precarious existence between East and West, till, in the early XIIth century, it emerged into the light of history. Henceforth it owned at one time or another the suzerainty of Venice, of Hungary, or of Turkey: but its real independence was never overcome. Its constitution dates from 1271. In 1417 it abolished the slave trade as "vile, criminal and abominable." In the XIIIth and XIVth centuries it had in its hands most of the commerce, banking, and even mining of the Balkan Peninsula. Its galleys were known to every port in Europe, and fought at Lepanto and in the Armada. In the first half of the XVIIth century it was the centre of a remarkable literary renaissance under Gundulić and other poets—the real founders of modern Serbo-Croat. The great earthquake of 1667 dealt it a blow from which it never recovered, and it dragged out a narrow patrician existence until its liberties were wantonly suppressed by Napoleon in 1808. From 1815 to 1918 it formed part of the Austrian province of Dalmatia.

The poet in this and the two succeeding acts (which are quite distinct, being laid in 1832 and 1900 respectively) depicts the strange and tragic mentality of the Ragusan patrician class which, impotent to check their own decay, lived in the past glories of the Republic and dreamt haughtily of the privileges they had lost. In Ragusa we have the amazing spectacle of an aristocratic caste of families renouncing marriage, with the deliberate aim of extinction, as the only dignified alternative to loss of power.

We deeply regret that space does not permit us to print Acts II. and III.: but we hope that the English public will ere long be in possession of Mrs. Copeland's remarkably fine translation.—ED.]

ACT I.

THE PASSING OF THE KINGS.

DRAMATIS PERSONÆ.

THE PRINCE	-	-	-	} Patricians of Dubrovnik	aged 72
SER ORSAT -	-	-	-		„ 41
SER NIKŠA -	-	-	-		„ 60
SER MARKO -	-	-	-		„ 36
SER NIKO -	-	-	-		„ 33
SER LUKŠA -	-	-	-		„ 42
SER VLAHO -	-	-	-		„ 27
SER MATO -	-	-	-		„ 70
SER GJIVO -	-	-	-		„ 60
SER GJONO -	-	-	-		„ 52
SER KARLO -	-	-	-		„ 30
SER JERO -	-	-	-		„ 29
SER TOMO -	-	-	-		„ 30
SER PALO -	-	-	-		„ 34
SER SABO -	-	-	-		„ 60
SER LUÇO -	-	-	-		„ 58
SER ANTUN -	-	-	-		„ 48
SER MIHO -	-	-	-		„ 50
SER ŠIŠKO -	-	-	-		„ 82
SER LUKO -	-	-	-	}	„ 50
SER VLAGJ -	-	-	-		„ 26
LADY ANNE MENZE BOBALI, Orsat's Aunt	-	-	-		„ 69
LADY DEŠA PALMOTICA, Ragusan noblewoman, Lady Anne's granddaughter	-	-	-		„ 27
KRISTINA, daughter of a commoner	-	-	-		„ 16
LUCIJA, Maid in Orsat's House	-	-	-		„ 60

The Scene is laid in the house of Orsat the Great, near Our Lady's Church, on 27 May 1806, between the hours of 4 and 7.30 in the evening.

Room in the house of Orsat the Great. The walls are hung with crimson damask. In the centre ponderous white, carved rococo folding door. Ranged against the wall Louis XVI. armchairs in red, white and gold, and on the left a large Louis XIII. bureau in ebony and ivory, then more chairs to match the others. On the bureau stands a new Empire clock mounted on alabaster pillars, with a red and gold face, and surmounted by the Napoleonic eagle; the pendulum is a great gilt sphere representing the sun. Various ancestral portraits on the walls. Doors to right and left, but neither so large nor so ornamental as those in the centre. To the left of the stage stands an Empire table with two or three books and gilt writing set with quill pen upon it. Beside the table two large Louis XIV. chairs upholstered in dark gobelins. On the right, between the door and the corner, a large open window. Not far from the table a gilt Empire bracket supporting a large gilt framed mirror and a marble slab upon which stand two silver candlesticks and two classical bronzes—the busts of Agrippina and Alexander. The floor is of Venetian mosaic. There is

no carpet. The room exhales an atmosphere of frigid opulence and order. The large central doors are closed. Those to right and left are open, but curtains of dark red silk are drawn across the openings. The hot May sunshine pours in through the window and creeps slowly upwards from the floor to the table, and up the walls, in ever deepening shades of crimson. With the sunlight is borne into the room the twitter of the black swifts circling round Our Lady's and St. Blaise's in the warm spring air for their merry evening chase. From time to time yet other sounds drift into the silent room—the voices of passers by beneath the window or some distant bell on the Konal,¹ or the cooing of the pigeons on the walls of ancient palaces; or a noise of talking and laughing punctuated by shouts which ring faint and muffled from behind the great closed white door. Perhaps the room within is equally heavily shrouded in damask, since the invisible, but intense conflict that would seem to be raging there is so well muted that it scarcely reaches us. But the old-fashioned silence of the house, which still seems to cherish the tribute of lamentation for the late Baron, the father of Lady Desa Palmotić and son-in-law of Lady Anne Menze-Bobali—you almost fancy you can inhale the perfume of the incense burned around him by the canons, ere they carried him away)—dominates even those small troubled voices;—and the swifts twitter like mad things, and the salad-woman calls placidly down the empty street into the mellow afternoon: "Salad! fresh salad!"

This impersonal life of sounds and the mute communion of lifeless objects continues until the spectator has fully surveyed the whole room and greeted the wide, radiant sky, which smiles and jests above the doomed city. But the great white door gapes. An invisible hand pushes it open. Like steam hissing out of a kettle when it boils and the lid is lifted lest all should bubble over into the fire, so in that moment there issues from the gap a great confused hubbub of invisible voices boiling over with passion.

VOICES [*rising, falling, sometimes an individual voice rings clear, sometimes they mingle*]: No good!—No good!—And who can believe them? Too late!—Listen to him! Ha! ha! ha! Caboga² had an easy job!—no good!—Orsat! . . . Orsat! . . . What freaks! Silence! Why?—Old fossils. Speak! Speak!

[*Out of this hurly burly emerges the old maid.*]

LUCIJA [*carrying a large silver tray piled up with tumblers, coffee cups, cake and sweetmeats. Obviously coffee has been served, but only very little has been eaten. Lucija is in national dress, but in mourning; her grey hair is braided with black cord. From under her short petticoat peep white stockings and black slippers. She frowns and grimaces in her anxiety lest some of the things should get broken, but succeeds in depositing the loaded tray safely on the table, whereupon she heaves a sigh of relief*].

¹ Village in the neighbourhood.

² Marino Caboga, a XVIIth-century Ragusan worthy, who saved the city at the time of the great earthquake in 1667.

VOICES [*in constant crescendo, heard through the open door*]: And who told you? Ah! Read! read! *Mon Dieu!* Certainly not! Why not? Liberty before all things! What price liberty with two city guards!

LUCIJA [*goes back to the door and stands for a moment with her head inclined as though to listen, but the old head droops, she closes the door carefully and returns to the tray, gesticulating on her way. She does not exactly evince contempt; yet you would swear that she would say "Be quiet!" if she dared. As soon as the doors are shut there is the same oppressive silence, the same brooding quiet as before. Lucija takes up the tray and, all unsteady with age and anxiety, goes towards the door on the right. At that moment is heard—*]

THE VOICE OF THE SALAD WOMAN [*below the window*]: Salad! Fresh salad!

LUCIJA [*close to the door, angrily*]: Go away! [*Exit.*]

A VOICE [*clearer than the rest, rings through the great central doors*].

ORSAT'S VOICE: Do you want me to send for him?

VOICES: No! No! . . . Yes! Yes!

[*Pause. Ominous, suppressed hum of voices.*]

THE VOICE OF LADY ANNE [*feeble, plaintive, yet somewhat apathetic, sounds from the room to the left*]: Lucija! Lucija! . . .

ORSAT THE GREAT [*suddenly parts the great double doors as though about to hurtle through them, but turns again abruptly towards the black gap of the opening, one hand on one of the open doors, the other grasping the heavy hangings which conceal the entire entrance of the invisible room, he hurls his words into the space within, each one weighty, bitter, flaming as the blood which has shot into his face, as if in a fever fit convulsing every nerve, contracting his heavy brows, beneath which blaze great restless, fiery grey eyes. His clothes are in the fashion worn by the young men of his day. Pure Empire. His face is clean shaven, except for side whiskers. His hair is iron grey, thick, and brushed upwards. Large mouth, clean cut as though cast in bronze, drooping in deep disdainful lines. All betokens the controlled fire, the vast intellectuality and idealistic impulse blended with the obstinacy of an indomitable pride*]: You won't, did you say? Of course! . . . If the commoner . . . the Jacobin, the freemason . . . were to come in *here* . . . into the *sancta sanctorum*—where would you be . . . you?

VOICES [*angry, unsteady, agitated*]: It's your house! He's crazy! . . . Now?—at the last moment? No . . . no!

ORSAT [*as before, his head thrust entirely within between the curtains, in a ringing voice*]: Crazy! . . . mad! . . . idiotic! . . . yes, yes . . . that, and worse, but . . . Once I've made up my mind . . . it's made up . . . ! [*suddenly draws back, abruptly slams the doors and shuts them. Swept away by the vehemence of his thoughts he rushes as far as the centre of the room; but there he comes to a halt and stands like one who, passing from darkness into bright sunshine, finds himself dazed, blinded and confused, still trembling from the torments and the conflict he went through yonder in the darkness. Orsat shivers, and casts one look of unutterable misery and horror around all this silent, refined emptiness. A mist gathers before his eyes and he leans heavily upon the Empire table in the centre. He closes his eyes, only to reopen them at once. Mechanically he passes both hands over his face, then clutches his thick hair convulsively. Two furrows, distinct as if traced with an iron, give him a look of age which is really due to profound melancholy. His eyes are fixed in a dull stare; he speaks in a whisper*]. And why all this? [*His look becomes still more set. Mechanically he takes a step or two forward; in a hollow, mysterious voice*]: Lazare . . . *veni foras* . . . said HE, and the dead arose! . . . [*his nerves relax, and the far-off shadow of a bitter smile flits over his spell-bound face; he nods gently and folds his arms*]: HE! . . . was God. And I? The dead sleep and arise again, but when the living want to die . . . [*noise and commotion behind the white door*] . . . if they want to! ? . . .

LADY ANNE [*short, stout, dressed all in black silk à la Louis XVI., with a chignon of white hair, carrying a fine lace handkerchief in her hand. She wears long transparent mittens showing the tiny, fat, very white fingers; she crosses straight from Left to Right. Her gait is as though she moved on rails, turning neither to the right nor to the left. Her face is set, pale, lethargic. The whole effect is quaint, senile, quasi-ridiculous; but the glamour of the historic greatness of her name, her venerable, highly aristocratic bearing and manner,—all go to make up a fascinating and haunting picture, as though one of the dusty portraits had stepped from its frame and entered upon an elfin, corporeal life in another, unfamiliar age. When she reaches the door on the right, she calls again in the same querulous, detached, soulless voice*]: Lucija! Lucija!

ORSAT [*although wrapt in his own stormy reflections, has nevertheless followed every movement of the unexpected apparition from her entrance. As if tired, he sits down beside the table and begins to write a note, but his glance strays all the time towards Lady Anne*].

LUCIJA'S VOICE [*from the Right*] : Did you call, my lady ?

LADY ANNE [*as before, still more severe and impassive*] :
Come down !

LUCIJA'S VOICE : Coming, my lady . . . in a moment !

LADY ANNE [*returns across the room exactly as she came, dreamy, senile, walking as though following an invisible line*].

ORSAT [*rises from the table, holding the letter in his hand, again involuntarily follows that black female shadow with his eyes*] :
Do you want anything, Anne ?

LADY ANNE [*close to the door on the left, neither turns, nor stops, nor looks at him, speaks in the same impassive, plaintive voice*] : Nothing. [*Disappears.*]

ORSAT [*still looking after her even when she has gone. Bitterly*] : That it should come to this !

LUCIJA [*enters quickly from the right ; she seems cross*] :
Here I am, my lady. [*Perceives Orsat*]. Ah ! . . . [*stops speaking and hurries on*].

ORSAT [*as before*] : Why did she call you ?

LUCIJA [*gives him a quick sidelong glance, as though she would like to say something, but did not dare*] : Why ? . . . [*mutters, anxious to be off*]. It'll be to-day . . . as it was yesterday, and the day before [*in a very low voice with rising anger*] and ever shall be—amen !

ORSAT [*contemplates the letter in some perplexity. His thoughts have already travelled far beyond the room*] : And what ails her ?

LUCIJA : You know, sir . . . once she gets a thing into her head ! [*she has reached the door, turns somewhat abruptly towards her master*]. She wants milk from Petrovaselo ! . . . she doesn't like ours here from Konal.

ORSAT [*as before, mechanically, looking at her*] : Then why don't you get it for her ?

LUCIJA [*as before, motionless on the threshold, in a low, deliberate voice*] : Why ? [*with a reproachful glance*]. Tell the French not to drink it.

ORSAT [*stiffens but does not move. Frowns, then says drily, curtly*] : Go ! . . . Your mistress is calling. [*then darts to the door on the right and calls sharply in a loud irate voice*] : Ivan ! Nikola ! Pero ! Where are you ? [*returns moodily, troubled, full of angry words, which he refrains from uttering*]. All ! . . . all ! . . . canaille ! . . . bolted ! . . .

LUCIJA [*who has not stirred from the door, but watched him in silence, with bowed head, almost sadly*] : My lord !

ORSAT [*sharply, annoyed; as though he had only just caught sight of her*]: What are you doing here?

LUCIJA [*as before, in a low voice*]: I wanted to tell you . . . You sent them to mount guard at the city gate . . . [*in a still lower voice, almost confused*]. It's their turn to-day. . . .

ORSAT [*closes his eyes for a moment, as if overpowered by weariness; then sits, rests his head on his hands and speaks languidly with numb indifference*]: Get her quiet first—then come here.

LUCIJA [*quietly*]: Yes, my lord [*Exit.*]

ORSAT [*remains alone in the same place, the same attitude, unable to rise or to shake off the bitter weakness which has suddenly overwhelmed him, as if in a dream*]: Deša! . . . Deša! . . . denied me by fate—yet I call you now! Help me to raise up the cross that is bearing me to earth! No, no! . . . Not even you would respond. . . . [*bitterly and contemptuously as he considers a fresh thought which tortures him*]. Ah! . . . how hideous it is to watch this ugly inglorious death . . . the death of old age!

VOICES [*louder within*]: What sort of liberty? . . . What sort of independence? . . . Ha, ha, ha! The mouse and the elephant! That's what you say? . . . Oh, well!

ORSAT [*does not move. An expression of extreme contempt flits across his face. His head droops still lower; his eyes seem to recede; he compresses his lips and hisses between his teeth*]: Snakes. . . . Snakes in the sun¹! . . . That's it! That's it! . . . wriggle!

LUCIJA [*enters by the door on the left and contemplates him sadly, then comes a little nearer and says quite simply as if she had noticed nothing*]: Did you want anything, sir?

ORSAT [*draws himself up slowly, passes his hands over his face, then rises to his full height; calm, impassive, but with set melancholy, gives her the letter*]: Go to Master Rado Androvič and give him this letter.

LUCIJA: Shall I wait for an answer?

ORSAT [*hesitates for a moment, then with an absent look*]: Tell him "Ser Orsat bids you to his house!" and come back at once.

LUCIJA [*approaches, takes the letter: says very softly*]: All right, sir.

ORSAT [*without moving, looks her in the eyes*]: Where is Lady Deša?

LUCIJA [*going, clasps the letter with both hands to her*]

¹ Historic utterance. In the Italian original: "*Vaso di vipere esposto al sole!*"

bosom]: In the chapel, praying [*pause*]. Do you wish me to call her?

ORSAT [*simply*]: Don't disturb her. Go! [*Lucija goes out without looking back.*]

ORSAT [*folds his arms, deeply musing*]: For whom is she praying?

[*The white doors open abruptly and all that muffled noise resolves itself into indistinct ejaculations, appeals and shouts throughout the room.*]

MARKO [*young, wizened, wiry, holds the door and calls in an angry, excited voice, while beside him appear three distorted, fiery faces*]: Orsat, where are you?

ORSAT [*stands still as marble, moves neither eye nor hand. Contemptuously, quasi soliloquising*]: If you were to kill me now,—well, I sha'n't budge!

MARKO

NIKO

VLAHO

[*Burst all at once into the room. The door closes of itself behind them. They crowd excitedly round Orsat, seize his hands, his shoulders in supreme agitation, their faces close to his as if they wanted to thaw him in the fiery furnace of their anxiety.*]

ALL THREE [*together*]: What is the matter with you? Where is Andrović? Why did you summon us here?—Speak, man!—Move! Bestir yourself! . . .

ORSAT [*as before*]: And what are they still talking in there?

MARKO: They're all shouting that Napoleon is—a God!

NIKO: And that you are crazy!

ORSAT [*still more sternly and disdainfully*]: Have they read the letters from Fonton¹ and Admiral Sinjavina?²

VLAHO: Brute Gjivo bellowed: "Death to the Cossacks!"

NIKO: And the Tories³ retorted: "We're not Vlach cattlemen."

ORSAT [*with a bitter laugh*]: More's the pity, we're not.

LUKSA [*opens the door. The noise again invades the room as he appears*]: The French are here!

ORSAT [*quivering, rushes up to him, seizes him by the*

¹ The Russian Consul.

² The Russian Admiral in the Adriatic.

³ *Salamanchesi*, Conservatives—"those who studied in Salamanca."

shoulders and drags him forward to the centre of the stage. The door is closed]: Beast! . . . Who? . . . Who told you?

LUKŠA: Well, Tomo came in just now with a fellow who says that he saw bayonets on Annunciation Hill!

ORSAT [*fiercely pacing the room*]: No, no, that's impossible!

MARKO: We are too late.

NIKO: Who will fight this old age?

VLAHO: And what about the commoners? . . .

ALL FOUR TOGETHER [*surround him with growing insistence and desperation*]: They used to tremble before you! Let's shut the gates! And every man of us to the city walls! Let's throw the keys into the harbour! Quick, quick, Orsat! . . .

ORSAT [*as though hearkening to some mightier voice than theirs, motions them away, and quietly, mysteriously, as though listening to something awe-inspiring, places his finger on his lips*]: Hush-sh! . . . Be quiet!

ALL FOUR [*fascinated, in an undertone*]: What is it?

ORSAT [*looks round, glances at the closed white doors which have grown silent as those of the grave, and then stares at his friends with dilated eyes. In a low hoarse voice, as if stricken with fear*]: They are silent!

ALL [*have grown pale, huddled together in a group. They gaze in terror upon that door, as though the silence had become personified, and they were trying to hear its footsteps*]: What has happened?

MATO [*opens the door, from which now no sound issues. Tall, sallow, iron grey, his hand curved around his mouth, he says quietly, deliberately*]: The Prince has sent word,—that he is coming here! . . .

ORSAT [*fiercely grasps the hands of his friends, looking at them as if he had only now become aware of their presence*]: That is the end!

ALL: Let us go! [*All go out quickly through the white doors, which close after them. The hum of conversation is still heard, but quite subdued and very remote. The Empire clock, with its thin, metallic, penetrating tone, strikes five.*]

LADY ANNE [*enters from the left on the fifth stroke, as before, impassive, dreamy, stiffly. She goes to the table, sits, her hands in her lap, then looks round, turning her head right and left, as if she were looking for something. Murmurs irritably, like one who is worried by many things*]: There! . . . What ails

them all to-day? . . . No Deša. No Lucija—[*looks at the clock*—not even Kristina! [*Like a little child sobbing softly when it has been left alone in the dark*]: Oh, dear! . . . Nobody hears me . . . nobody!

KRISTINA [*rosy as an apple, young as a dewdrop, in a pretty, youthful Empire dress of white jaconette, with little blue dots, and a bunch of red roses in her sash, comes tripping in, all out of breath, everything about her instinct with youth, joy and carelessness, from her black fillet and sloe black eyes down to her tiny black open-work sandals, through which peep—smile, as it were—white transparent stockings. When she sees Lady Anne, she stops and clasps her hands to her heart*]: Oh, dear—Lady Anne!

LADY ANNE [*neither turns nor looks at her; severely*]: Kristina! What is the time?

KRISTINA [*gives a rapid glance at the clock, then apprehensively crosses over to the table*]: Yes! . . . I know, five minutes past five! [*Fetches books and approaches Lady Anne softly, but with an air of importance*]: Ah! . . . but you should see, Lady Anne, you should just see the streets!

LADY ANNE [*as before*]: Kristina,—where is my footstool?

KRISTINA [*stoops promptly; finds the footstool under the table and places it under Lady Anne's feet. She remains thus on her knees before her; merrily, full of animation and laughter which displays her pearly teeth*]: Everybody's running! . . . And the crowds! . . . Because everybody wants to get to the city gates. And the boys have got cockades in their hats! . . . and all the ladies are at the windows with fine feathers and fans! . . .

LADY ANNE [*slightly worried, as though looking for something that bothers her*]: Kristina! There is surely some scent about?

KRISTINA [*searches likewise for a moment*]: Scent? . . . What scent? [*remembers her rose, and takes it out of her sash. With a merry laugh*]: Ah! . . . my rose, Lady Anne!

LADY ANNE [*sharply, indifferently*]: Throw it away, child. . . . It will give me a headache!

KRISTINA [*puts it in her pocket, with childlike naïveté*]: There you are! . . . go to bye-byes! I'm sorry, Lady Anne! But how can I help it! . . . the French are coming!

LADY ANNE [*motionless as an ivory image, severely, emphasising every syllable*]: The French are passing!

KRISTINA [*close to her, with childlike eagerness*]: And they won't stay!

LADY ANNE: Certainly not!

KRISTINA [*takes up a bulky volume, sighs*]: What a shame!

LADY ANNE [*leans slightly back in her chair with reproachful emphasis*]: Kristina, where is Metastasio?

KRISTINA [*subdued, as though her high spirits were damped, takes the book, opens it listlessly, sits at the table opposite to Lady Anne*]: Here he is!

LADY ANNE [*wearily*]: Before I go to sleep—how does it go? . . . [*recites in the old-fashioned style, without moving a muscle*]:

“Ye unjust gods, your harsh decree forbade
That I be born . . .

KRISTINA [*who knows it all by heart, holds the open book in her hand, and looks straight before her, nodding sadly, continues with correct expression*]:

. . . a lowly shepherd maid;
To tend a lamb had been mine only care,
My fate, beneath some humble roof to share

LADY ANNE } A simple shepherd's love!
KRISTINA }

[*Muffled noise in the room next door. Kristina cranes her head like a bird on a branch to listen, and asks*]: Lady Anne!

LADY ANNE [*as if roused from a dream*]: What is it?

KRISTINA [*points to the closed white door*]: Why are they shouting?

LADY ANNE [*unmoved*]: Go on with Metastasio!

KRISTINA [*quickly turns a number of pages, then reads somewhat crossly*]:

And wert thou born for pain,
Oh wretched heart of mine
And doomed in love to pine . . .

[*stops, as though something had occurred to her*]: Lady Anne!

LADY ANNE [*starts, bewildered*]. Ah!

KRISTINA [*quite carried away by her thoughts, ingratiatingly*]: Is it true, Lady Anne, that in France even the serfs can be lords?

LADY ANNE [*starts almost to her feet, greatly shocked*]: Certainly not.

KRISTINA [*sighs*]: There you are! [*almost sadly to herself*]. But there! it's all one—if they're only passing!

LADY ANNE [*reclines again in her chair, impatiently*] :
Oh dear ! . . . Kristina ! . . . Where is Metastasio ?

KRISTINA [*nods, still more sadly*] :

And doomed in love to pine

For one who for thy gain

[*Noise from the room. She looks inquisitively at the door, and listens to what follows, reciting the poem mechanically by heart*] :

To give thee full content

Would have thee still untrue !

[*Noise of crowds in the street ; joyful cries. Kristina is torn between her desire to overhear at once the voices from within the door, and those floating up from the street. She wants to jump up, only Lady Anne begins to recite, practically in her sleep*] :

LADY ANNE : I go ! . . . But whither ? Oh Heav'n !

KRISTINA [*sits down again, quickly turns several pages and continues fiercely, quickly, with rising emphasis*] :

I stay . . . what profit have I ?

[*The noise in the street increases. Lady Anne is fast asleep. Kristina looks at her, and—still reciting—flies like a bird to the window*] :

Therefore 'tis best . . . to die !

[*stands by the window and looks out*] : Ah !

VOICES [*from the street*] : Let's go and see them ! . . .
They're at Three Churches !—No ! No !—Below Posat !—Hurry up, Molly ! . . . Ha, ha ! Girls—It's as good as St. Blaise's Day !

KRISTINA [*comes down stage all bubbling over with impatience and rejoicing*] : The French are coming ! . . . and I stuck here . . . ah !

LUCIJA [*enters from the Right worried and in haste*].

KRISTINA [*flies up to her and hugs her*] : Ah, Lucija dear . . . let's go and see the French !

LUCIJA [*first amazed, then angry*] : I'll give you Frenchmen ! Whoever saw the like . . . ? Better help me to get away her Ladyship . . .

VOICE [*from the Street*] : Kristina ; . . . you're to come at once ! . . .

KRISTINA [*jubilantly*] : Coming, coming ! . . . [*takes the rose from her pocket, blows on it and tucks it in her sash*]. Ah, there you are ! . . . supposing Napoleon were to see me ! . . . who knows ? . . . Ha, ha, ha ! . . . [*pirouettes and violently hugs and kisses Lucija*]. Ah, Lucija dear ! There's a good time coming ! . . . [*Looks at the sleeping Lady Anne*]. Poor soul !

. . . It's not for her! [*dances right up to the door*]. Good-bye, Lucija! . . . Good-bye! . . . [*peeps in again at the door, her face all radiant with youth and laughter*]. Mind! If they do stay, I shall be my lady! Ha! Ha! [*Exit.*]

LUCIJA: [*Speechless before such exuberance, feels like crossing herself*]: Ah! . . . [*contemptuous and angry*]. But there! . . . Common people are all alike! [*approaches Lady Anne, looks at her and nods reflectively*]. Eh! . . . It would have been all over with you long ago, if we serfs hadn't stood by you! [*troubled*]. But now! . . . Better take her away!—where she can't hear nor see. [*Calls softly*]: Lady Anne!

LADY ANNE [*draws herself up slowly; she is as usual, only somewhat absent, detached*]: Has the sun gone down?

LUCIJA [*helps her to her feet and accompanies her towards the door on the left*]: It won't be long now, Lady Anne . . . Come away to your room and we will tell our beads.

TWO MEN [*from Konavlje (Canali), serfs of Orsat's, come running in from the Left, all perspiring, hot and breathless. They forget to take off their caps*]: His Lordship? . . . Where is he . . . Lucija, bestir yourself . . . speak, make haste!

LADY ANNE [*turns and looks at them in amazement, angry, but great in her pitiful weakness*]: What manners are these? . . . Asses! . . .

THE MEN [*stand, remove their caps, they are trembling with excitement and terror*]: They're here . . . at the gates . . . The French!

LUCIJA [*troubled, tries to lead Lady Anne away*]: Come away, my Lady!

LADY ANNE [*as before, looks fixedly, searchingly at the men*]: And if it were the Turks . . . that is not the way to come before your masters! . . . [*turns and goes out with Lucija*]. Good gracious! Indeed? Because the French are passing! . . . [*turns once more towards the men when she reaches the door; they stand twirling their caps in their hands, looking more and more abject and small*]: Yes! . . . that is just about it! . . . [*Goes out Left with Lucija. Great commotion audible from behind the white door*].

1ST MAN [*listens*]: They're in there!

2ND MAN: Still argufying!

1ST MAN: I'm going to tell his Lordship!

2ND MAN: Eh! So much the worse for them! [*They go out quickly through the central door, which closes behind them.*]

Short silence. Then one great cry from every throat—then again a brief silence.]

LUCIJA [*comes in quickly from the left, taking a letter out of her pocket*]: I had better give it him now. [*Goes towards the door.*]

ORSAT THE GREAT [*enters abruptly, his face flushed, his eyes blazing, his brows contracted into one hard band across his forehead. He thrusts the two men along, gripping them as with claws by the shoulders. He shakes them brutally, but is in fact distraught with grief and agitation*]: You! . . . You! . . . and you've seen them? . . . How many of them? Many, very many? . . . All gleaming with bayonets? . . . And the gates? . . . Speak! Cattle! speak . . .

THE TWO MEN [*in great terror*]: Closed—my lord!

ORSAT [*shakes them and tosses them aside like a handful of nutshells*]: So, already! [*The men escape Right. He perceives Lucija. Still full of rage and horror he goes up to her, grinning at her in mockery as if beside himself*]: And you? . . . What are you doing here? . . . What are you looking at me for? . . . Handsome fellow, ain't I . . . handsome, eh!

LUCIJA [*gently and simply hands him the letter*]: From Master Rado Andrović!

ORSAT [*seizes her by the hand, looks her in the face*]: And you, Lucija, faithful old soul—you too a bringer of bad luck?

LUCIJA [*as before, looks at him quietly*]: All he said to me was: "I am sorry for your master."

ORSAT [*drops her hand, as though suddenly grown calm. His face loses its flush; only a great pride irradiates every feature, every movement. Serene, almost smiling*]: And who is he, that he should pity me? [*opens the letter. Reads; for a moment his brows contract, but contempt flits over the pallid lips. He quietly crushes the letter, and then shows it to Lucija with an expression of ineffable sadness and subtle feeling*]. If you could read, Lucija, you would know what is meant by a gentleman! . . . [*pauses, then adds bitterly, to himself*]: He invites me for to-morrow, to a ball . . . which the Commons and a few—others—are giving in honour of the French! . . . [*stands musing, nodding disdainfully*].

LUCIJA [*approaches instinctively, and softly kisses his hand*].

ORSAT [*calm and cold; looks at her a moment, then asks simply*]: And she? . . . still praying?

LUCIJA [*shrugs her shoulders, lifts her eyebrows*]: Ah . . .

you know her, my lord. [*The central doors open gently from within.*]

ORSAT [*looks towards them and starts slightly, then quietly to Lucija*]: Ask her to come!—go! [*Lucija gives a long look at Orsat; goes.*]

[*The white doors are thrown open, and enter*].—

THE NOBLES [*old, young, middle-aged; short, stout; dandified, careless—but all of them, in greater or less degree, show signs of ancient high breeding and the bearing of men accustomed for centuries to command others and to lay down the law for them. A thousand years of authority and an endless succession of irreproachable aristocratic alliances has stamped them with a special, somewhat degenerate but altogether marked individuality. Some of them are eccentric as to their gait, gestures and dress; there are old men still affecting Louis XVI wigs; the young ones are all in the newest Empire fashion as regards hair and whiskers; and each has his own individual type. Especially now that they are among themselves, without any of the people or the commons to watch or criticise them, now, when the fateful historic hour lays bare the secret blots and hidden flaws in these stunted characters of kindred souls. Now every flutter of an eyelid, every whisper, every low spoken word has its own well-defined, inevitable, true meaning. The great storm shakes the dry leaves from the ancient oak of the Republic, and gradually exposes every knot, every wrinkle, every crack in the poor dead trunk, revealing all the nakedness of the seared, stripped and broken branches. The skeleton is already grinning through the parchment skin of mouldering old age.*]

[*The Nobles enter, conversing in animated but measured fashion. Many of them carry their hats in their hands or under their arms and lean on long canes with gold or ivory knobs. Niko and Marko at once rush up to Orsat, who never moves, but stands leaning against the table, with folded arms, morose and silent.*]

NIKO } [*aside, hurriedly, to Orsat*]: D'you know! The
MARKO } Prince has sent word that he knows his duty!

ORSAT [*unmoved*]: Good thing if he does!

GJIVO [*tall, strong, round-shouldered, large head, bright green eyes, grey hair, Empire clothes. He carries a large cane. His large, haughty mouth, steady, provocative look and fiery red complexion give him the appearance of a masterful, fierce personality. His hands are beautifully shaped and very white. He goes up to Orsat, and addresses him quietly, simply in a husky voice, but with a halting, jerky utterance, somewhat embarrassed and occasionally glancing aside. His hands are crossed behind his back*]: You see,

ORSAT [*rigid as a statute ; sharp and clear as a sword*] :
 . . . Under the Pyramids, Gjivo !

NIKŠA [*takes a chair ; with a subtle laugh*] : In our style,
Gjivo ! [*takes an old book from his pocket and begins to read*].

GJONO [*sly, little, with a large nose and gold-rimmed eyeglass; in an undertone, disdainfully, to Nikša*]: No lack of sincerity, in fact!

LUCO [*takes a pinch of snuff ; a wizened wooden man, with closed eyes and implacable grandezza ; almost to himself*] : More's the pity ! [*slight laughter from the various groups*].

VLAHO [*tall, handsome, black-haired, touchy, flares up*]:
Fine neutrality! To let the French . . .

KARLO [*large, stout, classical profile, typical Napoleonic hero; quickly*]: Marmont has promised that he will *go*, and we believe him ! Were it not so, we should have all sided with Orsat.

*All shout
against
one* { MARKO : Ha, ha, ha !—you believe the French ! . . .
LUKA : And to whom didn't they make the same
promise ?
NIKO : {
JERO : { And even if they hadn't !—we prefer them

another.

GJONO :	}	to the wild Cossacks ! What price the keys ! . . . Lackeys !
LUKO :		
MARKO :		
VLAHO :		

ORSAT [*motionless as if cast in bronze ; he merely frowns and closes his eyes for a moment as if all this bored him*].

GJIVO [*indignant because he cannot get a word in, thumps the floor with his cane, then shouts*] : At it again, eh ? We've had time enough, I should say ! *Three days' debate* in the Senate, and the whole blessed day here to-day ! . . . [*To Orsat, eagerly, almost kindly*]. So, as I said, you understand ; it's no good to get your dander up, because one battalion marches through by the Cattaro road. [*noise, commotion*]. And when they've gone. . . .

NIKŠA [*fixes him through his eyeglass, stops reading for a moment, maliciously*] : If they go ! . . . [*resumes his reading*].

GJIVO [*starts, then continues*] : . . . Then, Orsat, we will discuss all your propositions. [*Puzzled at Orsat's immobility, altogether simply and friendly*]. And if we have sparred a little. . . .

LUKŠA [*refined, dandified, as if he had stepped out of a Boucher picture, turns to Gjivo with a laugh*] : Gjivo calls that a little.

GJIVO : . . . Forget it, as we all shall. That's how we are ! . . . Can't help it ! One and all—eh—you understand me ? A bit cantankerous, that's all. . . . [*laughs boisterously*]. He, he, he !

MATO [*gaunt, dignified, tight-lipped, looks far away and slowly munches sweets which he takes from a little gold box*] : I beg your pardon, my dear Gjivo, but I don't understand you ! [*Gjivo stumps up to Mato to talk to him ; Marko, Niko, Vlaho, Luka, all surround Orsat in lively altercation, as if they would warm him with the heat of their own emotion*].

SABO [*tall, old, wrinkled, dull of eye, with a pendulous lower lip ; boundless, almost childish pride in his ancient lineage, says in a drawling, casual voice to Palo and Tomo*] : Of course ! . . . When the Emperor Francis begged me in Vienna to wait upon Napoleon as *cavaliere d'onore* of the Most Excellent Republic, I said to him [*drawls still more*] : Your pardon, Sire ! . . . a gentleman born, as we are, cannot associate with a person who is not my equal ! [*deliberately takes a pinch of snuff*].

TOMO, VLAHO AND NIKO [*amazed, scarcely able to credit such pride*] : Indeed !

ANTUN [*sickly, wizened and near-sighted*] : Then . . .

why . . . Sabo . . . why receive him now? [*Laughter in the group*].

SABO [*very decisively to Antun*]: First of all . . . if somebody's got to march through—better the French than the Vlachs. . . .

MIHO [*fat, unconcerned, as if he had just strolled in*]: And secondly?

SABO [*drawls out his words, turns as if to go*]: Secondly . . . Because I choose.

[*Commotion, talking, slight laughter. Orsat glances mechanically at the clock, as if he had just waked up from a long sleep.*]

ORSAT [*almost blandly, but with iron energy; only his eyes blaze and flash and thunder. He is conscious of it, and from time to time the inward struggle it costs him to control his emotion becomes visible. He speaks, and at once dwarfs all the rest*]: And so you think that we are agreed, and that when the Senate has said "Pass through"—that we must all cry Amen! Help yourselves!

KARLO: The law is the law!

JERO: That's what made us in the past!

ANTUN }
MIHO } Oh, there he goes! He's off again.
LUKO }

ŠIŠKO [*old, very fat; has so far been dozing in his chair; to Luco*]: What a bore!

VLAJ [*young, prepossessing, fidgety*]: And there's Maud waiting for me.

GJIVO [*to Orsat, almost ironically, but with suppressed anger, leaning heavily on his large cane*]: Of course! Help yourselves, and welcome! He, he, he!—and we may thank the Lord if they don't eat us!

ORSAT [*raises his voice, speaks more eagerly and more sternly*]: . . . And all that we have discussed here, and what I told you—I mean the letter from Admiral Sinjavin, who sent me word from Slano: "Don't surrender, we are here"! . . .

KARLO: Ha, ha! They are there!

JERO }
PALO } [*laughing*]: The Cossacks!
TOMO }

ORSAT [*bangs his fist on the table, scatters them with a cruel glance. Hard as a rock, he continues inexorably, as if cutting with an axe*]: And Fonton's message!—

GJIVO [*thumps with his stick*]: Filthy cub! [*great commotion*].

ORSAT [*louder, more defiant*]: . . . and the couriers from Sarajevo, from Constantinople, to say that they will help us as at the time of the earthquake.¹ . . .

[<i>In quick retort, like shot answering shot.</i>]	NIKO	}	And so they will! . . . The Turks sooner than the Christians!
	MARKO		
	VLAHO		
	LUKŠA		
	ORSAT:		And the letter from the Bishop of Montenegro!
	JERO	}	<i>Graeca fides!</i>
	LUCO		
	GJIVO		
	MIHO		

NIKŠA: There's another saying: "There's no faith in the Latins."

NIKO	}	Hear! Hear! Quite true!
MARKO		
VLAHO		

LUKŠA [*shouts*]: If you had let in the Vlachs, you would not have Lauriston at the gates now!² . . .

ORSAT [*continues*]: But all that wouldn't persuade you . . . because he is here! He—Napoleon—God! And when you so much as hear his name, you fancy it is the torrent which devours, the whirlwind which devastates, the flash which rends!

KARLO [*retorts sharply*]: Are we stronger than Venice? . . . or the Pope . . . eh?

PERO: . . . Or the Emperor?

TOMO: Or Spain, if you please!

ORSAT [*eagerly, vehemently*]: . . . Yes, we are, we are, since we have the man with us, who set the trap which will catch your—God. . . . [*great uproar*].

GJIVO [*with a noisy laugh*]: And who's that . . . who is it?

ORSAT: . . . He who sends you the message: "Wait, I am close at hand!" He who sent you the ships to Rieka³. . .

GJIVO: And Fonton to Grad!

KARLO	}	<i>boisterously; laughter and noise</i> : Ha, ha!
TOMO		
PALO		
		Two caravels! . . . True! It's true!

¹ In 1667.

² Reference to the dispute with Russia about the Orthodox Church at Grad in 1772.

³ A suburb of Ragusa.

ORSAT: Yes! Yes! . . . And *Fonton*, who sings to you in every key. When your Cæsar will be in the dust, you will have to reckon with us!

VOICES [*from all sides*]: That's it! . . . The same nonsense over again! Zounds, Orsat, have done! Speak! Go on! Why? [*great uproar, commotion around Orsat.*]

NIKŠA *with a serene smile to Miho, showing a passage in the book he is reading*: And what do you say to that? . . . "*Non jam regnare pudebit! Nec color imperii, nec frons erit ulla senatus!*" Ah? Sublime!

MIHO: Great! . . . But I would not give you one verse of Ovid for the whole of your Lucian. . . . For instance, listen to this. . . . [*takes a book out of his pocket and recites softly*].

3RD MAN [*enters, streaming with perspiration, hatless, breathless, almost falls at Orsat's feet*]: Ah, my lord, my lord!

ORSAT [*with a terrifying glance, grips the man as with a vice by the shoulders*]: Who are you? . . . What do you want?

3RD MAN: They've come—all of them. They're all over Posat, Brsalje—all is black with horses, men and guns. . . .

ALL: Ah!

ORSAT [*seizes him by the shirt and shakes him*]: And the bridge . . . The bridge? . . .

3RD MAN: It is still up, but

ORSAT [*afame, lets go the man, who runs away; as though the torrent of his passion had burst all bonds, his words soar with his idea and rise to the supreme height of agony*]: Ah! . . . Did you hear, did you hear? Between the invaders, their might and their emperor—and us poor wretches, us mere handful of old Republicans, us time-honoured champions of freedom, there is still one ditch, an abyss. The bridge is not yet down! . . . Oh, blessed be ye, lips of my people! . . . we can still make fast the chains upon our sacred walls, we can still die together, all united, all free!

NIKO	}	Let us go! Let us go! Yes! Yes!
MARKO		
NIKŠA		
VLAHO		

ORSAT: . . . We can still be alone . . . our own. . . .

GJIVO [*brutally*]: Will you plug their cannon?

KARLO [*ditto*]: Will you turn away the new freedom that is knocking at the gate?

SABO [*ditto*]: Will you have them bombard us?

MIHO: We will, we will! [*close to him, fiercely, in swift retort*].

MARKO : We can hold out for a week. . . .

PALO }
 MIHO } *shout sarcastically* : Why not for a fortnight ?
 ANTUN } Ha, ha !

ORSAT [*with passionate eagerness*] : And more, and more !
 Till all the highlands are up in arms ; till the men of Cattaro and Montenegro and the Russians are ready to carry on.

GJIVO [*in a loud voice, sneering*] : . . . And so to invade and harry us. . . .

ORSAT [*turns on him with suppressed indignation*] : Let them ! And they will do well to hang the lot of us on the big knocker at the gate if we help the enemy of our freedom ! [*great uproar. A dense crowd closes round Orsat, as you see it in the case of an accident*]. *Things threaten to take an ugly turn*].

LUKO [*in a timid, child-like, deprecating tone to Palo*] : Do you address Lauriston as *Your Excellency* ?

PALO [*exquisite Parisian type of a Napoleonic courtier, speaks with a semi-French accent*] : *Non, mon cher !* . . . But you do Marmont.

VLAGJ [*to Palo*] : I suppose one will have to call eventually.

PALO : Oh ! Vous verrez ! . . . Once they're here ! . . . They're such perfect gentlemen !

GJIVO [*breaks from the group, fiery red in the face, thumping the floor with his stick*] : Ah ! . . . And so you would dissolve the Senate and admit the Commons. . . .

ALL : Ah !

GJIVO : Better say at once, that you want *Revolution* !

ORSAT [*folds his arms, strides up to him, with a piercing look*] : And if I say I do—are you going to forbid me ?

GJIVO [*glares as one tomcat does at another*] : Yes—precisely. While there is the Prince and the Senate, so long it is *We* who have decided to admit the French into the city and while *WE* are in the majority.

KARLO }
 JERO }
 TOMO } Yes, yes !
 PALO }
 ANTUN }

ORSAT [*still closer, paler than before*] : And who is—*WE* ?

GJIVO : We—the nobility !—which will break even you, if you set yourself against the decisions of the Republic—d'ye understand me ?

NIKO }
 MARKO } How can you say that?
 VLAHO }

LUKŠA [*with profound reproach*]: But, Gjivo—the Republic dies!

ORSAT [*with supreme sarcasm, without moving, simply looks Gjivo over from head to heel*]: And who shall say to Gjivo: “Live, Gjivo!” when Gjivo wants to die?

GJIVO [*in black wrath*]: Orsat!

ORSAT [*in the same tone*]: How could our royal blood sit in the Senate cheek by jowl with the Stalli, the Vodopici and the Vlajki . . . since commoners have nothing but their lives? . . . [*Commotion, cries; Orsat continues with the terrible impassivity of a judge*]: And do you know why we nevertheless admit foreign sans-culottes and Jacobins—eh? . . . Because when emperors are troubled with land hunger, they begin by buying the nobility!

GJIVO }
 PALO } [*as if about to hurl themselves upon him*]: Oh!
 TOMO } but that is infamous! . . . that is a lie!
 MIHO } You're mad! mad!

VLAGJ }
 NIKO } [*contemptuous boisterous laughter*]: Imperial
 MARKO } flunkys!
 VLAHO }

SABO }
 ANTUN } Dirty Vlachs!
 JERO }
 LUKO }

LUKŠA [*to Gjivo and his adherents—in a ringing voice*]: You are worse than the Dalmatians.¹

[*Deafening clamour. Sneers, insults, altercations, jokes are bandied to and fro in the fading light. Suddenly the clock strikes six in low but penetrating tones. The thin sound overtops the tempest, and with the sixth stroke an involuntary silence has fallen. A silence full of apprehension, in which you can hear every breath. This lasts but for a moment, like lightning, and then, like Fate incarnate, a red apparition looms in the door,—the Prince*].

ALL: The Prince! . . . [*and again falls silence, as though some great black bird had broken its wings and were drifting and expiring on murky waters*].

¹ Historic utterance.

THE PRINCE [*enters, attired in his red robe of State, with a long shoulder cape, and underneath a court suit à la Louis XV. of red satin with diamond buttons. White stockings, black court shoes. White full-bottomed wig. His face is clean shaven, his expression moody, senile, with the family characteristics,—eyes as if sewn up between the lids and pendulous lower lip. He carries a large gold-mounted cane. Two city guards in red appear behind him in the semi-darkness*].

VOICES FROM THE STREET [*pierce the portentous silence of that hour*]: Quick! . . . Quick! They're still at it. Let them get on! *Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité.* Hurry up, Molly! [*Loud laughter in the street. Silence.*]

VOICES OF NOBLES ON THE STAGE [*subdued, like the rustling of dry leaves*]: Did you see him? . . . Who permitted him! To leave the palace! In the cloak of State! Disgraceful! It is plain that *all* is over!

THE PRINCE [*has come forward from between his attendants slowly, with short dragging steps. He pays no attention to the rest, who look at him with varying expressions of amazement and curiosity. His mind is obviously taken up by some small, almost absurd matter. His lips move, and a half smile hovers about the pendulous mouth. When he reaches Nikša, the latter stops reading in order to measure him ironically through his eyeglass. The Prince looks at Nikša for a moment, then laughs more distinctly and nods as he points to a letter which he holds open in his hand*]: Here is the letter from Antun Sorga in Paris. I found it!—He!—It would be worth your while to read it. Especially now. And d'ye know how it begins? [*laughs softly to himself till a little cough chokes him*—Ah! My dear Mary could not get over it! Just fancy! [*Reads the letter through a big gold-rimmed magnifying glass, which hangs under his cloak*]: “Most Excellent Prince!”¹ My dear Marius! Why hasn't the devil taken you yet? [*Commotion. The Prince chuckles to himself, then reads further*] Then . . . “So the Republic is still alive, etcetera, etcetera! [*continues with a senile half cough, half chuckle*]. There's a devil of a fellow! . . . [*as if he had just remembered something*]. Ah! . . . before I forget . . . [*turns to the various groups*] Karlo and Tomo . . . yes! I rather think I had come to remind you of what you have to do.

ORSAT [*is on the point of interrupting him, but*]——

THE PRINCE [*looks at him in amazement, coldly, disapprovingly, and continues in an ordinary, natural voice*]: Lauris-

¹ Excerpt from a letter actually written by Prince Sorga Pozzo.

ton is at Pile¹ and called to Luka through the city gate: "What answer from the *Signoria*? Will they let us through the town?" Luka told him to wait, and ran over to me . . .

[*Hubbub in the street. You distinguish Voices*]: Let them in! . . . Have they gone to sleep?

THE PRINCE [*takes snuff, then carefully dusts his white lace front and the cloak, lest a speck should remain. Then he resumes, impeded by his little cough, but quite casually*]: So then I thought I had better dress and come to tell you.

LUCO [*aside, to Sabo*]: He really ought to have stayed at home!

SABO [*sneers, in a low voice to Antun*]:

"Little Tinto keeps the gate!²
in a scarlet robe of State."

ANTUN [*to Sabo, continues laughing*]:

"More useful is the robe of State,
Than both Tinto and the gate!"

Ha! Ha! Ha!

ORSAT [*shakes as if in the throes of fever*]: But—Prince—you will not—thus—now! . . .

THE PRINCE [*as before, fails to understand him*]: But what are you thinking of? I shall go and receive him at the Palace with all of you . . . in great pomp . . . and Tomo and Karlo will go to Pile and tell him that we protest—that we are neutral—and, in short—that he may pass through.

KARLO }
TOMO } We are ready!

THE PRINCE: I gave orders that when you start, our banner is to be raised outside St. Blaise's . . . and city guards and soldiers to be drawn up round it

NIKŠA [*sarcastically in an undertone to Mato*]: "Oh! what a fine show!—what a fine show!"³

MATO [*similarly to Nikša*]: Nothing lacking but the Chinese lanthorns!

THE PRINCE [*bows deliberately to left and right*]: And now . . . your Excellencies . . . come with me! . . . Lauriston had better see with whom he has to deal!—[*laughs complacently*]—And when they have passed, I shall answer Antun [*laughs to himself*]. There's a witty fellow!—He! he!—"We are alive, and the devil has not taken us yet!" [Turns to go, bows

¹ A suburb of Ragusa.

² Ragusan nursery rhyme.

³ Oh, chë bella festa! oh, chë bella festa!

again, but more profoundly to all the nobles]: My lords! . . .
[goes towards the door. All bow to him].

ORSAT [*who has so far been restrained by his most immediate friends, suddenly starts forward, closes the great white doors and places himself against them, stern, great as Orlando, as he faces the Prince*]: No!

ALL [*in unutterable amazement, with one voice*]: Orsat!

GJIVO [*shouts, seems on the point of throwing himself on Orsat*]: Let him pass!

ORSAT [*firm as a rock, glorious as St. Michael on the threshold of Paradise, in a ringing, terrible voice*]: No!—This is my house!—This is my door!—I am master here!

THE PRINCE [*quaveringly, almost alarmed, but not without a certain pitiful dignity*]. Orsat!—I am your Prince! . . .

ORSAT [*in unutterable anguish*]: And therefore, because you are my Prince, behold me . . . on my knees before you! [*Falls on his knees at the Prince's feet.*]

ALL: Ah! . . . rise! . . . Sublime! . . . What a man . . . Whatever is the matter with him? . . . What a play-actor!

ORSAT [*continues, and his words are now the tears, the fire, the last appeal of Freedom*]: . . . and here I kiss your robe, as I kissed my dead mother's face and I say to you:—"Lord! do not hearken to us in our wickedness, do not regard our pitiful, degenerate faces,—consider in the hour of fate that we are not your equal, no—but your slaves, your servants . . .

GJIVO [*as if beside himself, rushes about among the nobles*]: D'you hear him!! . . . He rails at the nobility!

ORSAT [*louder and more bold, as if with the fire of his eloquence he hoped to thaw the ice that binds every soul about him*]: . . . and consider that we have forgotten all that our ancestors have wrought since they first came to these crags,—and that our soul is quenched, and that we no longer know what manner of men were our sages, our poets and our mariners and our martyrs, who out of this eyrie fashioned a shrine and saved the honour of our enslaved race!" [*Still more insistently, clinging to the Prince as though he were the Cross of Salvation, while every face, every hand, every eye around him is aquiver with passion.*] "And say, within the deeps of your soul, that we are the last remnants of a very ancient and exclusive stock, grown aimless, bloodless, powerless,—and when you have recognized all this, Prince—speak but one word—only one."

THE PRINCE [*involuntarily quite puzzled, understanding*

nothing and looking all around as if seeking an interpreter for this alarming flow of words] : What word? . . . What?

ORSAT [*still on his knees, supreme supplication in his voice and all his being*] : "I am the Master!"

ALL [*greatly perturbed in every variety of expression*] : Awful! . . . Immense! . . . Orsat!—Be quiet.—Speak! . . . speak!

ORSAT [*rises slowly as if transfigured*] : And command that the bridge be broken,—proclaim that the nobility is no more,—that there is but the people and Thyself!—Then imprison all of us, ring the great bell of Our Lady's—and take thy seat, Lord, beneath the arches of Thy palace, with thy people around thee—to be, if thou wilt, even as Marin Faliero . . . only save our Republic,—save it from the foreigner,—save it from—ourselves! . . .

GJIVO [*cat-like*] : And we tolerate this outrage! . . .

ALL GJIVO'S PARTISANS : Come away! . . . come away—The Senate governs! . . . The Senate!

ALL ORSAT'S PARTISANS [*crowd round him with solicitude and try to recall him to his senses because they too believe that his mind has become clouded*] : Orsat! . . . Orsat! . . . rouse yourself! It's no good!

ORSAT [*His eyes are fixed in a horrified stare, he shakes himself free*] : I live! . . . I live! . . . Do you hear! [*looks at the Prince, as though he had only just caught sight of him*] Why is he red? why? when he has none of that beautiful hot blood which washes away all sin; when he has no tears, no pain,—when all this perishes in the mire, in shame, in filth . . . ah! [*quasi delirious, as though he saw vast prospects from a height*] There . . . there . . . the gates are thrown open—the bridge falls;—they're coming in . . . coming in! . . . They! . . . How many! . . . First the French! All gold plumes, banners! . . . Fine men! . . . All athirst for glory, all greedy for women! . . . And now the rest . . . the rest, oh! . . . worse and worse, and fouler and fouler!—Wretched, poverty-stricken, savage! And all want to crowd through that gate! . . . mocking, spitting upon our black walls, grunting like swine:—"Where is thy Crown? Where is thy Freedom! Thou art become even as we!" Oh! . . . [*While Orsat is thus transported, the Prince slips away accompanied by Karlo and Tomo; Gjivo and his partisans gather round and see them out, then remain in the background to witness Orsat's agony with indignation and cold smiles.*]

ORSAT [*comes to himself; but the train of thought which carried him to the height of ecstasy has altered its key, and he looks at them all as though in hopes of finding some other way of approaching the torpid soul of the nobles*]: We are still in power! . . . I . . . you . . . we!—We Kings!—We masters!—Where we appear, even emperors are our allies! . . . And our seas and our strongholds—and our churches . . . and the Palace,—all is still there—a living reality! And all this is to vanish! And our children to forget the very emblem of freedom—to go forth questing into the world to find our name, right, authority, and not to know that *this* State was the State!—and all the rest slaves, only slaves . . . [*turns from the one to the other with the glad enthusiasm of youth, yet with eyes full of questioning doubts and fears, lest his words be powerless, spoken in vain*]: But if this thousand-year old land of Freedom must perish, we too will go! . . . brothers! . . . children! There are our ships in the harbour. Let us aboard, hoist the banner of St. Blaise, and fare forth as did our fathers of old. Oh, happy voyage! . . . Let us go! Let us go! The gulls and the clouds will ask us: “Who are ye? What seek ye?” . . . and our sails will give answer: “Dubrovnik is on the sea . . . Dubrovnik once more seeks a desolate cliff to shelter Freedom. Tell us of it, ye clouds! . . . Guide us to the blessed Grecian shores, to the land of the Gods!” [*All have drawn near. All are troubled, touched. Some have tears in their eyes. Gjivo gives an involuntary shudder.*] Oh! . . . [*Orsat in transports of ecstasy, sure that his words will yet become facts.*] Oh! . . . Blessed be those tears! . . . quick . . . quick . . . run . . . seize the keys . . . Oh! saved . . . saved . . .

[*A gun fired in the distance.*]

ALL [*startled*]: What is that? . . . Guns firing! . . .

GJIVO [*somewhat embarrassed*]: It is the signal . . .

ORSAT [*with dreadful misgiving*]: Signal? . . . signal? . . . and the Prince? . . . and Karlo? . . . and Tomo? . . . where are they? . . . [*Perceives a malicious smile on the lips of Gjivo, leaning on his cane and swaying carelessly to and fro.*] Ah! . . . [*he understands.*] Traitor! . . . [*wants to attack Gjivo, but his friends hold him back.*]

GJIVO [*in a cold, deep, casual voice, like a different man*]: You cannot complain, Orsat! We have let you say *all* you wanted to! [*To the rest, in a businesslike tone.*] First signal you understand: Lauriston receives our envoys . . . [*Second shot.*]

Pause, fraught with fateful silence. Gjivo continues in a lower tone, as though speaking to himself.] And . . . the second! . . . lets in the French.

ALL [*in gloomy amazement, horror, uncertainty, or relief*]: Ah!

ORSAT [*controls himself by a superhuman effort. Like an image of bronze he stands upright, alone, rigid, in the centre of the room. Only the wild light in his eye, the quivering lips, the terrible coldness of his voice betoken that a tempest of passion is raging in his soul, but that he is master of the storm. In a natural tone, with a disdainful smile, with perfect good breeding, he turns to the various groups with a polite sweep of his hand as if to greet them and take leave of them all*]: Of course! Pardon me for detaining you,—but I did not realise that everything was already in vain.

NIKO :	}	[<i>All tender him their hands, look in his eyes, would fain embrace him, kiss him, but his soul is remote from them all</i>]: Oh!—our
MARKO		
LUKÇA		
MATO		

Orsat! . . . What shall we do now?

ORSAT [*looks at them from the height of supreme irony*]: Since we have not cut their throats! . . . [*closes his eyes for a moment in sheer agony.*] Go! . . . go! . . . leave me alone.

GJIVO [*approaches him, perplexed, but almost kindly*]: D'y'e know!—now that it is over . . . let us forget it all.

ORSAT [*stabs him with a look; in a low voice, hissing between half-closed lips*]: Be off! . . . instantly . . . let me never see you again! . . . [*as Gjivo is about to flare up*]. This is my house . . . Do you understand? . . .

GJIVO [*with blazing eyes, grumbling to himself*]: Family of humbugs! [*Exit.*]

NIKŠA [*with neat irony, tucks away his book in his pocket*]: I'm wondering, Orsat, what sort of faces we shall wear to-morrow when we wake up?

ORSAT: Worse luck!—the same!

MATO	}	[<i>Leave one by one, gripping Orsat's hand in silence; then they go out speaking quietly among themselves</i>]: Truly a very fine speech! Something too theatrical! . . . But he is a bore! Not one of us!—I'm sorry for him! And after all we sha'n't be in time to see the general! In the clouds, like his late mother!
LUCO		
VLAGJ		
PALO		
JERO		

LUKO

ŠIŠKO [*who has slept through the entire scene, heavy, asthmatic; in going out, says to Miho*]: Is it quite certain that Napoleon will abolish entail?

MIHO : Rather ! . . . and at once !

ŠIŠKO [*with a wrathful, contemptuous glance at Orsat*] : Then what is he grumbling at ? [*Exit.*]

LUKŠA [*in going out, with a bitter smile to Nikša*] : And d'you know how it's all going to finish ? . . . With a ball and a Hungarian band ! He ! . . . he ! . . . you'll see ! you'll see ! . . . [*They go. Gradually they all go out. The great white doors remain ajar, showing the black recess of the now silent room within.*]

ORSAT THE GREAT [*alone*]. [*Pale, broken, with a catch in his throat, with dishevelled hair, drags himself to the great half-open door, and surveys the scene with a vacant crazed look. He listens to the retreating steps of the departing guests, to the cheerful commotion in the street, the twitter of the swifts—and all his grief surges to his lips. Vain his strength, vain his will. Something chokes him. In a smothered, hollow, tremulous voice*] : No . . . no . . . I won't ! . . . All is finished ! . . . all—
all ! . . . [*with a great sob, as all his strength fails him and giefs way*]. Oh, Mother !—Mother !¹ [*Flings himself, great as he is, on the little chair beside the table, buries his face in his arms like a little child, as his whole body shakes with uncontrollable weeping. In the silence of the dead house you hear nothing but his most bitter sobbing, like the moan of a slaughtered animal. In the black square of the open doors a female figure becomes distinguishable in the shadows.*]

DEŠA [*sombre and mysterious, stands as though on the threshold of death, without moving a step. Her long black gown falls in heavy, even folds about her tall figure, and cloaks her altogether in the garb of sorrow. The low bodice is draped with a white transparent fichu, à la Marie Antoinette, setting off the statuesque neck. Short black sleeves contrast with her snowy arms. Glorious fair hair, only slightly powdered, crowns her head as with a tragic halo. And her face, with the long classical features, and proud lines about the firm-set mouth, the large deep-set blue eyes and that white drapery—all recalls Delaroche's Marie Antoinette, and especially at this moment as she stands there, portentous, like destiny fulfilled. Pale, calm, cold and mysterious she watches—stands and watches, watches the shipwreck of a man—Orsat the Great. In one hand she holds a prayer-book, in the other a kerchief ; both hands hang down*].

ORSAT [*raises his head and his face appears distorted with*

¹ *Aimeh meni !—majko moja !*—Pronounced as if it were Italian. The literal translation would be : “ Woe is me !—mother, mother ! ”

anguish. *Despondently he nods his head which he has thrown back, resting it against his clasped hands*]. Nothing, nothing! . . . Not my prayers, nor my curses, nor my tears! . . . Oh, for shame—Orsat weeps! . . . Orsat! . . . Nothing—availed! . . . The moth, the moth flutters round the candle! There! her wings are gone! . . . Frozen souls! . . . empty hearts! . . . Neither judgment nor interest—nor fear! . . . [*starts up, as though he saw them all before him*]. Not even that pride which decked their miserable bones until this day! I see them still . . . and the sight will remain with me till doomsday [*shudders*]. Oh! how pretty they were! . . . how shallow! . . . How they hated me for seeing the ugly, secret thoughts which passed through their heads and which they dared not utter! Oh! and their eyes, their silence, their smiles! Everything spoke, shouted:—Why do you detain us? . . . why do you strip us? . . . we are naked, naked!” . . . Oh! . . . [*quivers from head to foot with agony; then with a far-off look, and still more far-off voice*]: And I was mad enough to think . . . what? . . . That my word could raise the dead . . . [*his stare grows more rigid*]. Lazarus! . . . Lazarus! . . . [*rises slowly as if in a trance. His hand clutches his hair. The sun is about to set. The clock strikes seven. He does not hear it. The flaming level rays illumine him. Speaks as if in his sleep.*] Not even He, Christ—could have thawed their ice-bound souls!—Not even He [*nods, then shivers involuntarily. Consciousness returns and with it all the misery of the wretched, inexorable reality. His voice sounds tired*]. Strange! . . . how cold I am! . . . [*Looks round. Nothing but the swifts, gambolling before bedtime.*] Alone! . . . alone! . . . All have left me—as though it were all my fault! Even she!—my own! . . . Stern, great heart, the one human being! my only faith—even She! . . .

DEŠA [*still at the same spot, in the same attitude, only more pale*]: I am here!

ORSAT [*turns suddenly and stands entranced before her. Pause. They look long into each other's grief-stricken faces; then he says softly*]: Oh! . . . why are you so pale?

DEŠA [*steadies herself with one hand on the door*]: I have looked upon death! [*She is about to move.*]

ORSAT [*quickly, almost appealing*]: Oh! do not move! . . . You have risen from the deeps of my desire! . . . [*drops his voice, never taking his eyes off her*]: You are beautiful as Death! . . . and as proud! The same disdainful lips, not

made for love,—the same white marble hands which gather the flowers of Life [*with the serenity of despair*]: Thou art,—thou art the only one who should be here now,—to behold me,—to call me . .

DEŠA [*crosses over to him, takes both his hands and looks deep into his tear-dimmed eyes*]: I—or—Death?

ORSAT [*in gloomy dejection, draws away his hands*]: And why have you come now?

DEŠA [*leans gently against his shoulder. The sun's dying rays shed a blood-red light upon them. In a low deep voice, pointing to the flaming sun-set framed in the window*]: Don't you see?

ORSAT [*gives a cry, then seizes her by the hand, and gazes into the sinking sun*]: Ah, the sun is going!

DEŠA: The sun of Freedom! . . [*almost clasped in one another's arms, mute, they stand beside the open balcony*].

ORSAT [*breaks the silence*]: How peacefully he sets!

DEŠA [*leans her head on his shoulder*]: Will he ever return?

ORSAT [*in a very low voice*]: This one,—never! . . .

DEŠA [*leans altogether towards the light, watches spell-bound*]: Look . . . look! . . . just a little . . . one beam . . .

ORSAT [*as in a dream*]: Yes . . . yes . . .

DEŠA [*draws away from him and moves forward towards the sun, her hands joined as if in prayer*].

ORSAT [*clings to her shoulders with both hands, lays his head on her shoulder, and a single sigh breaks from his lips. The sun vanishes*]: Ah! . . .

DEŠA [*crosses herself and clings close to him. A shiver runs through her frame. Quite softly, as if terrified*]: He is gone! . . .

ORSAT [*comes forward, bowed down by his thoughts, but calm*]: When he returns to-morrow, he will not know us for the same! [*A great sound in the distance, and singing as of a mighty multitude.*]

DEŠA [*approaches the window, turns and glances eagerly at Orsat,—as if she wanted him to close it quickly*]: Ah! . . . my God!

ORSAT [*rises and looks at her. They understand one another. The sweat of death is on his brow, but there is no more passion, nor wrath, nor fire in him. The sun has set! Bitterness and regret enter gradually, like night, into his soul. Whispers softly, but calmly*]: It is they!

DEŠA [*startled, turns away from the window, points with trembling finger into the distance*]: They! . . . they! . . .

ORSAT [*sits down again, then speaks quite softly, like a man haunted by memories at night*]: Come!—here!—close to me! [*the singing draws nearer*].

DEŠA [*comes quite close to him and crouches on the floor, half-kneeling, while he throws his arm round her as if in protection. With suppressed ire*]: Accursed song!

ORSAT: Ah, do not curse! . . . listen!

[*And now the hymn of the Revolution rises sublime and triumphant in the early evening. A whole army is singing. All the pigeons, all the swifts, wake up and circle in terror above the town. Those two poor souls cling yet more closely to one another; but, as though the glorious chant drew them upward, they rise involuntarily and stand embraced like a group of statuary. Hot tears are coursing down Deša's face. The singing gradually dies away, as the troops turn down another street.*]

ORSAT [*fascinated by the glorious melody, sadly bows his head, whispers*]: Oh! . . . how beautiful it is!

DEŠA: Do you know it?

ORSAT: I heard it in Paris,—when the king's head fell! [*pensively, lowers his voice*] as ours to-day! . . .

DEŠA [*gazes fixedly, as if before an abyss. The singing fades away altogether in the distance. Softly, mysteriously, almost to herself*]: What are we now, Orsat? . . .

ORSAT: Slaves.

DEŠA [*involuntarily starts away in horror and cries*]: Oh, not now! . . .

ORSAT [*taken aback*]: What is the matter?

DEŠA [*looks at him intently*]: I wonder—shall we ever be happy again after this hour?

ORSAT: Maybe—if we forget!

DEŠA [*draws away from him, tragic, full of mystery*]: And who could do that?

ORSAT [*flies up to her, seizes her with sudden violence; hanging upon her answer, fiercely*]: You would leave me?

DEŠA [*pale, helpless, but resolute*]: No.

ORSAT [*holding her by the hands, looking into her face*]: So many sorrows! . . . so much grief! . . . and now as we touch the threshold of our bitter fate . . .

DEŠA [*faces him squarely*]: I love you!

ORSAT [*with dreadful misgiving, takes her face between his hands and looks at her. Thus Œdipus might have looked at the*]

Sphinx : Why won't you—now? [*lays his hand on her mouth*].
Yes! . . . Yes! . . . I see it in your eyes—in your lips! . . .
You won't—and why not?

DEŠA [*all her soul in these words*] : Will our children be—
like ourselves—slaves?

ORSAT [*with tragic calm, releases Deša ; all aquiver with
grief, he says*] : They will! . . .

DEŠA [*whispers him, fascinating and terrible*] : Then—
choose!

ORSAT [*turns and stands before her, appalled, entranced,
filled with horror and regret. As if to himself*] : Most sad, most
sweet, great, as Death! [*suddenly flies to her, clasps her, strains her
to his breast. Their lips meet in a long, passionate kiss. They
part as if at the end of their strength, separate, and he petrified,
grief-stricken, but having attained the supreme peace past under-
standing, says with manly brevity*] : No!

DEŠA [*presses his hand, wan as death she takes her prayer-
book and goes towards the door. On reaching it, she turns and says
in a level, tired voice*] : Shall I close it?

ORSAT [*leans against the chair and looks fixedly at Deša.
Shrugs his shoulders. With a bitter smile*] : You do not close it
upon the dead. [*She waves her hand solemnly as though in crossing
the threshold of Death she were wafting a salute to those who remain
on the further shore of the dark river of Life, and goes. Orsat bows
his head, then sinks slowly into his chair, broken and silent.*]

VOICE OF THE MILKWOMAN [*below in the street*] : Milk,
ladies! . . .

LADY ANNE'S VOICE [*from the room on the left*] : Lucija!
Lucija! . . .

ORSAT [*hears, recognises the sounds of everyday life, folds
his arms on his breast and whispers to himself*] : And now? . . .
[*remains lost in thought*].

VOICE OF THE MILKWOMAN [*loses itself in the cheery
clamour of the crowded street, remote and fitful*] : Milk, ladies! . . .

CURTAIN.

POEMS.

FROM THE RUSSIAN OF A. A. FET

Translated by Oliver Elton.

THE HAWK AT LIBERTY.

None came, on dainty fare to rear you,
Or house you warm from winter's sting;
No careful hand was hourly near you
To pet you and to smoothe your wing.

With crags beneath and skies around you,
A fledgling, on that mouldering oak,
You tested all the storms that found you,
And battled with them as they broke.

Did hunger, heats, or tempests lash you ?
Your puissant youth defied all these.
The risen sun could not abash you,
Outfacing him across the seas.

But the hour comes, and you are ready :
You loose your pinions from the nest,
And fling them wide, and poise them steady,
And soon are launched on heaven's broad breast.

FORGET ME, MADMAN.

Forget me, madman, and forgo thy passion,
No longer mar thy peace !
My image thine enamoured soul doth fashion;
Let this delirium cease !

And, dreamer, one thing know, faint heart that fearest ;
Writhe as thou wilt and cry,
When this thy air-spun dream is hovering nearest,
Then, furthest off am I !

So, charmed by the moon's visage in the river,
The child shrieks out for glee ;
He plunges in ; the troubled waters shiver,
The silver features flee.

Then, infant, dry those tears that still are brimming,
And let not dreams enthral ;
There, up in heaven, the true bright moon is swimming ;
Here, is no moon at all.

OBITUARY.

ALEXANDRE BLOK.

ALEXANDER BLOK, the greatest of modern Russian poets, died in Petrograd in August, 1921, at the age of thirty-seven. He died of an exhaustion not merely physical, rather spiritual indeed, since he had experienced deeply the intimate significance of the tragedy of recent years,—and at last the burden became too great to bear. He lived throughout on some wonderful border-line. He was in the midst of life, not of it, yet sensitive, as no others were, to the play of hidden forces in and around all the movements of men. These forces he apprehended as a poet; he felt their strange rhythm; he interpreted them in a music that was intensely personal, simple and direct. There are poets who walk this earth as beings from another world. Such a one was Blok. He was very human. There was not a shadow of arrogance in him or lofty reserve, no hint of spiritual pride, nothing imitative, pretentious or false. He lived as a man among men, taking his experience as it came and by some irresistible impulse communicating it in incomparable verse. Unassuming in manner, maintaining a gentle reserve amid the noisy intellectual disputes of his day, he had the gift of warm sympathy and friendship. It seemed natural that he should be remarkably handsome and that there should be charm in his smile and in his slow speech. Everything about him was natural. There was nothing forced. Yet amid all the hurrying throng he was apart and alone.

Blok's father was a professor of law in the University of Warsaw; his mother was the daughter of a well-known botanist, Professor Beketov, and a distant connection of the famous Solovyev family. As a student Alexander Blok came under the influence of the philosopher Vladimir Solovyev, and accepted wholly his mystical interpretation of the universe. About the year 1900 there was a new movement among the Russian *intelligentsia*, a search for new forms in art, a revolt against the narrow and colourless conceptions that for years had done duty for philosophy. There was a new and eager interest in religious questions, an effort to break through the old deadening rationalism into some broader sphere of thought. Solovyev's influence in this new movement was very strong. Those who took part

in it felt that a new dawn was appearing; they were carried away by the sense of a new surge of spiritual forces. In this atmosphere of eager inquiry Blok came to manhood, and it was in those years he began to write verse that, beside the charm of its mystical content, was remarkable for its sheer technical skill. He had not to search laboriously for form: the poetical form he required seemed naturally to come to him. For several years Blok wrought for himself alone and for his intimate friends. The old intellectual tradition was still strong; the outward forms of life were unchanged. There was a disturbing sense of anticipation in the air, a vague unrest, a struggling apprehension and a hope still obscure. The more sensitive spirits were profoundly moved, but Blok's verse at that time would have been totally unintelligible to the great majority of Russian readers. The lyrics that he published from time to time attracted the attention only of the very few. Some great change was needed before Blok could come to his own. Then broke out the Russo-Japanese war, followed by the first Revolution, which shook the whole fabric of Russian society from top to bottom and created a tumult of thought and inquiry.

In 1905 appeared "Poems on the Fair Lady." They came as a revelation. Nothing like this had been seen in Russian poetry for years. Blok suddenly became popular. Not that he was understood, or at least understood in any literal sense. Any attempt to deduce from these poems of Blok's a systematic philosophy or to trace in them the record of any tangible events in his experience, would have been doomed to failure. Critics who tried to estimate his work by traditional standards threw up their hands in despair. Yet in a deeper sense he was understood. The music of his words carried with it a subtle meaning that appealed especially to the young who were awaking to all kinds of confused emotions. Blok spoke to them of things they felt, but could not say themselves. He enlarged the boundaries of speech; he gave a convincing form to far-ranging presentiments. Then the finally convincing fact was that his work was simply and victoriously beautiful.

From that time on his calling was clear. What he lived and felt, he wrote—the struggle of flesh and spirit, the fascination of earthly and heavenly beauty, broken lights and entrancing perspectives, and the sudden closing in of bitter reality in collapse and failure. Now a glimpse of the unseen in the noise and ugliness of the towns, a cry of passion, the

misery of weakness and betrayal—and again, the liberating peace of the snowy plain, a gentle movement of mystic presences, the great power of the secular longing of Russia.

It is useless to attempt to reproduce in English words anything that Blok wrote. His power is in his untranslatable music, in the absolute fitness of his words to his emotions. In one poem he calls himself a fallen angel. Perhaps he was. Yet if he fell, he rose continually. It was given to him to represent on earth some great spiritual conflict. Again and again the knowledge of this breaks from him: "I was poor and weak and little," he says, "but the secret of some great Majesties was revealed to me before the time: I knew the Highest. An unworthy slave, not guarding the treasures entrusted to me, I was a king and by chance a guard."

His personal experience was intimately connected with the obscure spiritual disturbance amid which he lived. He was in a profound sense a herald of revolution. Not that he was in any sense a partisan. He took no part and little interest in politics. He did not understand the disputes of political parties. He loved Russia passionately. He felt the movements of her spirit, and faithfully he expressed all the tragic complexity that he felt. When the Revolution came at last, he rejoiced for a moment, and thought that release had come. He was carried away by a sense of cosmic upheaval.

In a note discovered among his papers after his death he wrote: "In January, 1918, I for the last time surrendered myself to an elemental force no less blindly than in January, 1907, or in March, 1914. I do not repudiate what I wrote then ['The Twelve'], because it was written in accordance with the element; for example, during and after the writing of 'The Twelve' I sensed, physically, audibly, for several days a great noise around—a combination of noises, *probably the noise of the crash of the old world.*"

He wrote that marvellous poem "The Twelve," the most vivid picture of Revolution that has been seen. From that time till the end he wrote hardly anything. The exaltation faded away, and the growing misery of the new conditions bore hardly upon him. He sank under it, and at last, with a sense that his calling had gone from him, he departed. When he went, the wonder of his having lived and sung in our time suddenly shone forth.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

N. S. GUMILEV.

Nikolay Stefanovich Gumilev, who was executed by the Petrograd Cheka on 27 August, 1921, is one of the most prominent figures in the recent history of Russian Poetry.

He was born in 1886, in Tsarskoe Selo. He studied in Paris and Petersburg. His first book appeared privately in 1905. In 1912 he was the leader of the movement started by the younger Petersburg poets, as a reaction against the metaphysical poetry of the Symbolists. They called themselves Acmeists, and their poetry is a return to more concrete and realistic modes of expression. In 1914 Gumilev enlisted and fought in the diversion in East Prussia and later in Macedonia. He was twice awarded the St. George's Cross. After the general breakdown he returned to Petrograd, and in collaboration with the novelist, E. Zamyatin, started a studio of literature, where he taught the younger poets the secrets of their craft. Nearly all the younger poets of Petrograd are in one way or another pupils of Gumilev. He was involved by the Cheka in the "Tagantsev affair," and put to death, together with sixty other "intellectuals." He was a Monarchist, but no evidence has been produced that he took any part in anti-Bolshevist activity.

Gumilev's poetry is romantic, he called his first book "Romantic Flowers" and a Romanticist he remained to his end. His poetry is permeated with the spirit of romance, but it has a concrete romanticism, the romanticism of beautiful things, thrilling adventure, and distant country. He called his muse the Muse of distant Travel. He had himself travelled in Africa, and retained a peculiar love for that continent. His poetry is manly, almost boyish. His favourite reading was boys' literature, and much of his poetry will probably become boys' poetry. He was a straightforward, simple, unsophisticated soul, and his religion (which is seldom the case in Russia) is a simple, unquestioning faith. His last books are full of this spirit.

Of his books the following are in print :—

- (1) *Zhemchuga* (*The Pearls*), originally published in 1910; it includes his early masterpiece "The Captains." A reprint has been issued by the Mysl Press of Berlin.
- (2) *Koster* (*The Pyre*). A book of lyrics.
- (3) *Farfarovy Pavilyon* (*The Porcelain Pavilion*). Imitations of Chinese poetry.
- (4) *Mik*, an Abyssinian poem of fantastic adventure.

These three were originally published in 1918; the following are reprints by the Mysl Press of Petrograd :—

- (5) *Ognenny Stolp* (*The Column of Fire*), Petrograd, 1921, his last, and, together with "The Pyre," his most mature book of lyrics.
- (6) *Shater* (*The Tent*), Reval, 1921: a book of verse about Africa. It includes "The Equatorial Forest," a tragical story of a French explorer on the Congo, probably the best example of his narrative style.

D. SVYATOPOLK MIRSKY.

HVIEZDOSLAV.

ON November 8, 1921, the Slovak branch of the Czechoslovak nation lost the most important representative of its poetry. His real name was Pavol Országh, but as a poet and spiritual leader of his people he will always live in its memory under his *nom de guerre* of Hviezdoslav. The family of which he came was settled for many centuries in the mountainous Orava, and belonged to the lower and poorer Slovak gentry of that beautiful district. He was born on February 2, 1849, at Vyšní Kubín, where his father possessed a farm, and in the local church a private pew with his family arms. At first his parents wished him too to be a farmer, but as his health was rather frail and his character dreamy and melancholy, they sent him to the Magyar town of Miskolcz, where he spent three years at the gymnasium. He finished his school education at Kežmarok (in the Zips district) and already began to write in verse—in Magyar, of course, because the school nearly denationalised him. During the long vacation of 1867, however, he changed his mind under the influence of his mother, a former teacher and the Slovak poet Matúška, and since that time his national consciousness increased steadily, though it never turned into a narrow chauvinism.

From 1870 he studied law at Prešov (Eperjes) in eastern Slovakia, preparing himself for his future vocation. In 1873, on finishing his studies, he visited Prague for the first time in order to be present at the celebration of Jungmann's centenary, and to strengthen his older connections with Czech literature. Soon after he married and passed advocate, settling in the small country town of Námestovo, not very far from his native place. In the seclusion he wrote most of his poetry. From there he undertook several short journeys to Germany and Poland. In Námestovo, after some struggles against the old-fashioned views of a narrow-minded editor, he won the name of the best Slovak poet. At the age of

fifty he ceased to practise as a lawyer and moved to Dolní Kubín, where he afterwards educated the children of his brother, wrote new verses, and arranged his collected works. He was not a politician in the usual sense of this word, but the turbulent year 1918 placed him among those who represented the political aims and efforts of the Slovaks. In the spring of that memorable year he went to Prague, to take part in the festivities connected with the jubilee of the National Theatre, which symbolically prepared the independence of the Czechoslovak people; and after the armistice he became a member of the first National Assembly in the capital of the new State. Last year a severe attack of influenza nearly proved fatal, and, though he seemed to recover, his days were already numbered. At dawn of a cold November morning he passed quietly away, and five days later was accompanied by the representatives of the whole Czechoslovak people to his last resting place.

Hviezdoslav belongs to those poets whose importance cannot be thoroughly understood unless we consider the circumstances under which they wrote and the influence which they exerted upon their countrymen. During the Magyar oppression, when there were practically no Slovak schools, no Slovak Academy, no Slovak University, and only a very few inferior institutions which could voice the cultural tendencies of the subjugated people, a good writer had to be a teacher as well; he had to enlighten and encourage those who suffered from injustice and hung their heads. These duties Hviezdoslav fulfilled from the beginning up to his death. In his first collection of lyrics, called *Prviesenky* (Primroses, 1868), we find poems imbued with youthful pessimism or at least scepticism; and also in his later books, in his *Letorosty* (Twigs, 1885-1895) or *Stesky* (Complaints, 1900-1915) we discover from time to time gloomy thoughts preying on his mind and heart. But as a whole his lyrical poems testify to his manly courage and confidence, to his idealism and deep love of his country and nation. Especially his *Žalmy a hymny* (Psalms and Hymns, 1882-1892) and *Krvavé sonety* (Sonnets written in Blood, 1914-1915) represent this almost pathetic manliness expressed in fervent words of reflection or prayer.

In the middle period of his literary activity he produced a considerable number of epic poems. Biblical or historical stories and personages, as well as the everyday life of the Slovak villages, form the chief subjects of the smaller ones. Three of these epics surpass the rest not only in length but also as impressive pictures of the people and nature in the mountain district

of Orava. *Hájnikova Žena* (The Gamekeeper's Wife, 1884) tells us the tragic story of a young and beautiful wife of a gamekeeper, how she kills the son of the lord, who is her husband's master, when he intrudes into their cottage to offer her his love, and how she expiates her crime by temporary madness; *Ežo Vlkolinský* (1890) and *Gábor Vlkolinský* (1897-1899) depict in broad lines the life, manners and customs of the Slovak villagers and gentry throughout the year, their private sorrows and family festivals.

The vivacity and power of many scenes in these poems give evidence of Hviezdoslav's dramatic talent. From his youth he dreamed of the theatre, read classical dramas and wrote several popular plays, but, living in a small country town, he had very little opportunity of acquiring the experience without which it is rather difficult to produce good drama. Hence his greatest work of this sort, the tragedy *Herod and Herodias* (1909), is so ornate and so exuberant that it is impossible to play it in its original form. In the last months of his life he was working at a new popular drama, but was prevented by death from completing more of it than an outline of the plot and a few scenes.

Like Vrchlický and others among his contemporaries he also tried to widen the literary horizon of his countrymen by translating foreign poetry—from Russian and Polish, from English, German and Magyar. Lermontov, Pushkin, Mickiewicz, Stowacki, Shakespeare, Goethe, Schiller, Petöfi, Madách, Arany were the poets whom he introduced to Slovak readers; and *Faust*, *Hamlet*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Boris Godunov* among those works which he translated into his native dialect. Although he published four bulky volumes of his collected poems (Turčianský Sv. Martin) many of his writings were printed only in periodicals.

The younger generation will probably class some parts of his work differently from their fathers and grandfathers, who welcomed nearly everything he wrote without discriminating between real inspiration and rhetoric eloquence. But even the remote future will certainly call him a true poet, whose considerable gift of vision and poetic expression enabled him to catch and fix some evanescent glimpses of his native district, to encourage his countrymen by verse and image at a period of dark oppression, and, above all, to infuse new life into the poetic diction of Slovakia.

F. CHUDOBA.

IVAN VAZOV.

IVAN VAZOV, the Bulgarian national poet and novelist, was born in 1850 and died on September 22, 1921. There was hardly a phase of Bulgarian life during these seventy years which did not come within the sphere of Vazov's own experience, and the main lines of his career differ little from those of many of his contemporaries. His father, who had a small business in the village of Sopot, was almost uneducated; it was from his mother that Ivan inherited his love of books, and it was she who encouraged him in his wish for education and in his first attempts to write. Ivan received his earliest education in the primary school of his native village; later on he went to a school at Kalofer, and finally to the gymnasium at Plovdiv. Several times his father brought him back to help in the shop at Sopot, but Ivan had neither liking nor aptitude for business, and, while he was at Plovdiv, he had begun to read French and Russian literature and to write verses himself. For a time he became schoolmaster at Mustapha Pasha, and, later, an employé on the construction work of the Sofia-Kiustendil Railway. While on a business visit to Rumania, Vazov came into touch with the group of young Bulgars who were spending the time of their exile there in making plans for further insurrections against the Turks, and he naturally found himself in complete sympathy with their ideals. He was implicated in the unsuccessful revolutionary movement of 1876, and was forced to take refuge in Roumania. After the liberation of Bulgaria, he served for a time as a Government official, but, after Prince Alexander's abdication, his political sympathies compelled him to leave the country for some years; he was Minister of Education in the Stoilov Cabinet from 1897 to 1899, when he definitely retired from public life and devoted himself to writing. Vazov's earliest works were published in 1870 and, from then on till the last year of his life, he produced poems, plays, novels and short stories in rapid succession, for he believed it to be the duty of an author to write a great deal. In October, 1920, the nation celebrated with great honour his jubilee as an author and the Sobranje accorded him a grant of 100,000 levas. When he died, a year later, the Bulgarian people mourned him as the father of their literature, their teacher and friend, the interpreter of their joys

and sorrows and as almost the only link which bound the outside world to them in sympathy.

The long list of Vazov's works would convey little to British readers, for, though many of his writings have been translated into various foreign languages, the novel "Under the Yoke" (" *Pod Igoto* ") is probably the only book of his which has been at all widely read outside Bulgaria. To a great extent, therefore, foreigners must be prepared to accept the judgment of Vazov's own countrymen as to the value of his work. His writings have helped to fix the literary form of the Bulgarian language, and Bulgars recognise the fidelity of his character drawing, of his pictures of rural life and Balkan scenery and of his historical backgrounds. They appreciate, more fully than it is possible for foreigners to do, the music of his verse and the interest of his dramas. He is the natural Poet Laureate of his country, who does "but sing because he must," and his writings—to name but a few—"The Banner and the Lute," "The Sorrows of Bulgaria," "The Deliverance," "The Epic of the Forgotten," "Slivnitza," "Songs of Macedonia"—serve as a record of the emotions stirred in all Bulgars by the events of their history from Turkish times down to the catastrophe of the last war.

Vazov wrote best of the things with which he was most familiar. The sufferings of his country under Turkish rule, the death of young patriots in the struggle for freedom—such things were burnt into his consciousness. One of his first teachers had been the father of Hristo Botev, himself a poet and hero of the early insurrectionary movement. Vazov's father had been, together with other village notables, killed by the Turks in 1876, and his native village burnt, while his mother had fled for refuge to a mountain monastery. It is of such episodes that *Pod Igoto* treats, the story on which his fame chiefly rests. The alliance between Bulgaria and Turkey in 1915 seemed to him unnatural and unholy, and his last years were darkened by his country's sorrows which were the outcome of this alliance.

To the foreign reader, Vazov seems a photographer of real life even more than an artist with creative power; his style is forcible and direct, rather than graceful or subtle. His characters are devoid of self-consciousness; it is almost as if, like the Russian actors who several years ago presented some of Chekhov's plays in London with such peculiar effect, his men and women spoke with their backs turned to the public. Vazov's closest literary kinship is, perhaps, with Russian writers; like Gogol in *Taras Bulba*, he has preserved for other generations pictures of types

of character and ways of life which are now disappearing or have already vanished. Sometimes he is not unlike Hardy in his choice and treatment of a subject, and, like him, he preferred in his later years to express himself in poetry; on the other hand, his stories, with their simple language and love of country for almost their only philosophy, can be understood and appreciated by even the humblest of his compatriots. It is difficult to find a parallel to Vazov's position. Very rarely has a new country in the first half century of its independent existence produced a writer whose pre-eminence has at once been recognised by his own countrymen, and it is still more rare that such a writer, though possibly on the strength of a single book, should be accorded high rank abroad wherever his work is known.

ELLINOR GROGAN.

J. D. BOURCHIER.

JAMES DAVID BOURCHIER, who died in Sofia on December 30, 1920, was not only an outstanding figure in British journalism, he was one of the makers of the modern history of the Balkans. An Eton master, with strong classical interests, he suddenly found himself in 1888 in Roumania and Bulgaria as special correspondent of *The Times*, and from that time on his heart was in the Balkan struggle. The Balkan states were free, but the pressure of Turkey, accentuated by the rivalries of the Powers in Constantinople, was still strong. Each little state was groping amid the new problems of independence; they were watchful and jealous of each other, they were vexed not only by domestic troubles but by the conflicting movements of international policy. In these circumstances Bouchier, as a clear-headed and warm-hearted Englishman, soon gained an exceptional position. He had to play not a passive, but a very active part. He travelled incessantly, consulted with and advised rulers and politicians, conciliated rivals, shared in the development of policy. His political interests were to him no abstract intellectual sport. They were reinforced by ethnographical and archæological enthusiasms which gave breadth and glow to all his constructive effort.

As a classical scholar he took a keen interest in Greece, but in the whirl of Balkan passions Bouchier could hardly be expected to retain a cold impartiality, though he was decidedly impartial when he found it necessary to point out to any Balkan ruler

that he was doing wrong. He had a preference, however, among the peoples, and that preference was for Bulgaria. Something practical and stubborn in the Bulgarian character appealed to him, as giving more promise of stability and steady progress than the qualities he noted in the neighbouring peoples. He became distinctively the friend of Bulgaria, a critical but kind and most helpful friend. He had endless disappointments and met with obstacles that were hard to surmount. It was very largely through his agency that Bulgaria took the lead in the formation of that Balkan League which lived just long enough to carry through a successful war against Turkey in 1912. That was the crowning achievement of his career. After the war the old rivalries broke out more violently than ever, and when the Great War came Bouchier had the bitterness of seeing the country he most deeply cared for taking the side of the enemy.

He returned to Bulgaria after the war, since that land was still home for him, and he hoped to see the wounds healed and what he held to be a great wrong gradually repaired. To Bulgaria he was a living conscience, and the Bulgarian people have frankly recognised that to have won such a man as he was both an honour and an obligation. The affection of that big-hearted man for the Bulgarian people was a continual testimony to a worth too often clouded by evil guidance. Bouchier is buried in the Monastery of Rilo, where he longed to rest. His name is held in reverence by the people to whom he gave of his best.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

CHRONICLE NOTES.

(We hope in future numbers to publish, in addition to such brief political and economic notes as are here subjoined, periodical surveys of the general situation in each of the Slavonic countries. For this we shall depend partly upon the kindness of collaborators, and shall be grateful if short notes on subjects of current interest can be sent to us at King's College, Strand, W.C.2. We should also welcome short notes (not necessarily in English) on current books, and other bibliographical details.—The EDITORS.)

The Russian Famine.

The outstanding fact in the life of Russia is the famine. Before the war it often happened that in some districts the whole crop of grain would fail to ripen, but with the increasing communications it was possible to avert the worst effects of famine by supplies from other parts of Russia. The corn-growing areas were so rich that grain was almost the principal article of Russia's export; in particular, Germany largely depended on Russian rye. The present famine, according to the best expert authority, is due in the first place to the attempt to apply Communist principles to agriculture: the peasant was ordered to surrender without payment that part of his crop which was not allowed to him for his own consumption. In 1918 the peasants generally ceased to grow more than they would be allowed to keep for themselves, and parts of their holdings went out of cultivation. In this way the towns were deprived of their natural supply, and in many parts the town inhabitants lived by travelling down to country districts to find peasants who had hoarded grain which was not required for their own use. In 1919 the Soviet Government took the matter in hand and sent down military columns, which forcibly seized much even of that grain which was required by the peasants themselves. This principal cause of the famine was aggravated by the almost complete breakdown of communications, which was due both to the Revolution and the civil war which followed it, and later to the unusually severe drought of last year. The struggle with the famine was made more difficult by the fact that a small group of persons with extreme theories had appropriated all right to public initiative, and even arrested organisations set up among the public for the purpose of famine relief.

The magnitude of the disaster can hardly be exaggerated. It has principally affected the Volga, which is one of the most important granaries of Russia. The population was driven to find any kind of food—bark, leaves, roots and rotten bones. Dead bodies lie everywhere. Whole villages have become extinct and whole areas have passed out of cultivation. From Simferopol, in Crimea, we recently learned that several families have closed their houses and asphyxiated themselves by lighting their samovars. Cannibalism has become common. An instance has recently reached us in which the local medical authority, being unable to combat it, limited itself to indicating which dead human bodies might be consumed.

This enormous catastrophe has thoroughly stirred the feelings of Western Europe and America. Invaluable work has been done by the American Relief Association named after Mr. Hoover, though some of its supplies have been held up by the collapse of the railways until they were almost

spoiled. The Americans were also the first to create a system by which food parcels could be sent to private persons in Russia. Three British organisations, at first working independently, agreed, on the initiative of Sir Benjamin Robertson, to make their efforts in common. They were the Save the Children Fund, of which Lord Weardale is Chairman; the Society of Friends, who have had a long experience of relief work in Russia, and the Russian Famine Relief Fund of Lord Emmott. Efforts were at first directed almost solely towards keeping children alive, but it was later realised that the reconstruction of Russia could not be left to a generation of children. All the organisations already named succeeded in bringing their help to some of those parts where it was most needed; it is established, for instance, that 99·5 per cent. of the American supplies reached their destination.

General Conditions in Russia.

For a year past there has been much more freedom of trade, and most articles of first necessity are obtainable. Prices have risen enormously and without any relation to the rates of payment of work—at least for most public employees and other persons receiving any fixed income. There was a harvest in the Petrograd and Moscow districts, and it is there that life is easier. The worst conditions are in the middle and lower Volga, the Odessa district, the Black Sea coast in general, and the middle and south Urals. There is no special shortage of foodstuffs in Siberia. Where there is no famine, country life is much easier than town life. The goods which are most needed are clothing, underclothing and boots.

Most persons are taken up with the daily necessity of supplying their needs, and this preoccupation sets the tone of thought in general. Work is conducted under great difficulties. These are lightest for speculators and for the higher specialists and technicians, whose situation has latterly been the continuous care of the Soviet Government. Professors and specialists receive from the State a full food ration for themselves and some supplies for their families. Most of the townsfolk are either in Soviet employ, in trade or in factories. Of these, the only persons interested in politics are those factory workers who are either Communists or else in continuous controversy with the Communists.

Town Life.

The towns have fallen into great neglect. Moscow being the centre is in comparatively better order. Some repairs are being made and the streets are now being kept cleaner than last year. Petrograd has only a third of its former population (700,000 as against 2,500,000); the population of Moscow is now about $2\frac{1}{2}$ millions. Petrograd is the point nearest to Europe and therefore receives the most help from abroad. Even there intellectual life, such as lectures, concerts and theatres, continues; there are very few cabs owing to the price of fodder; at the stations there is a rickshaw service for luggage; only a few tramlines are working, but with some regularity. The markets are now the centre of town life and almost serve in the place of clubs. In Moscow there are more trams, but they are crowded. They are no longer free of charge and the fares are constantly rising. Owing to lack of accommodation many live outside both in summer and winter. The standard of the theatre and of music has in no way fallen, as the Soviet Government has made great efforts to protect the fine arts, and the position of persons in these professions is quite satisfactory.

Country Conditions.

The dominant interest in the country is food and the sale of food products for the purchase of articles from the towns. The peasants are now compelled to follow much more closely the policy of the Government, and their intellectual needs are therefore greater. There are far more schools than before, as the Government is introducing universal instruction; even many of the oldest folk have learnt to read and write. There are very few cattle, owing to the requisitions and food shortage. This has diminished the area of cultivation, and it is only latterly that peasants are resuming abandoned ground in the hope of selling their produce. Many townsfolk have come to live in the country, obtaining considerable grants of land on the condition of working it; among these are many former factory workers. Decentralisation is proceeding apace, and the sphere of interests in the country has thus been very much narrowed.

Elections.

The overwhelming majority of the peasants are non-party. The Cantonal Soviets are, therefore, mostly the same; such Communists as are to be found secure election, but are in a great minority. The District Soviets elected at the Congress of the Cantonal Soviets contain many more Communists. In the Provincial Soviets, the Communists are usually in the majority. This is largely because non-Communists do not see much use in participating in them, while the Government promotes in many ways the election of Communists. The Central Soviet of the country has an enormous Communist majority. It is this body which elects the Executive. The Communist party has latterly carried out a purge of its membership, which therefore now numbers about 170,000. However, the Central Government is more and more frequently appointing to posts experts who have little or no regard for Communist principles.

Moscow exercises a control over outlying areas in all the principal questions of economic and administrative policy; but the lack of communications inevitably increases the independence of such areas and compels them to exercise more local initiative for the settlement of their more immediate and pressing economic questions. The most independent areas are Ukraine, the Urals and Siberia.

Government Organs.

The Red Army attracts many elements, as every soldier receives food and clothing. The non-commissioned officers are largely Communists who have served in the ranks. The higher posts include many specialists who were officers of the old *régime*. Discipline and equipment are tolerably good. The total number is variously estimated at between one and two millions.

At all the chief railway stations, in all Cantonal and Provincial Soviets, and in all sections of the Red Army, there are clubs and centres of propaganda which are supplied with literature from the centre. These are the only places in the country districts where one can obtain printed matter, except for school libraries, which are promoted by the Government. To this propaganda the vast majority of the population remains indifferent.

The Extraordinary Commission (*Chrezvychayka*) is now under the direction of the Commissariat (Ministry) of Home Affairs. Its work is

entirely directed to the detection and removal of those who are actively opposing the Government. In the country its influence is little felt. It is directed against persons as such, and punitive expeditions have been discontinued. In the chief centres its activity has lately been revived in connection with the renewed excitement among the left wing of the Communists and the persecution of the Orthodox Church.

The Church.

The Orthodox Church is now much more independent of the State than it was before the Revolution, and more dependent on the people. This has unquestionably brought it much closer to the masses. It exists on free offerings of parishioners. The revival of spirit in the population reflects itself on the Church, which, under the present distressing conditions, forms a rallying point where people meet and share the hope of better times. The Patriarchate, or single headship of the Church, which was restored in 1917, gives to it much more unity in the minds of the believers and makes it a centre of union for a great part of the Russian people which is not friendly to Communism. There is, however, a section of the clergy which strongly emphasises the ideals of Christian Socialism, and a much smaller part of it which has actually entered the Communist party. The examining and exposing of relics, conducted by the Government, undoubtedly served to discredit the Church among many of the younger peasants, but the need of religion remains and Communism as a belief has quite failed to satisfy it. The influence of the Patriarch, which has been used with great wisdom and restraint, is very strong and helps to create a certain atmosphere, though it is not expressed in any acts of hostility to the Government. Bishops have latterly been able to visit their various parishes without hindrance. Churches are not nationalised. The Church land has been handed over to the peasants.

The famine induced the Government to demand, as has been done in earlier national crises, material support from the Church. The Patriarch welcomed this appeal; but it was carried out in a ruthless way and without respect for objects of special reverence, such as ikons and holy vessels. This produced great indignation and protests, which the Government has repressed by arresting a large number of priests and sentencing several to death. This action, followed by the placing of the Patriarch himself upon trial, has aroused wide indignation among all Christian Churches in the West; and these feelings were voiced by the Archbishop of Canterbury in his speech in the House of Lords on 25th May and in the special prayer which he issued to his own clergy on behalf of the Patriarch Tikhon.

The Revival of Religion.

During the last three years there have been abundant signs that every channel of religion in Russia is now full to overflowing. In the towns as well as in the country, the churches have been crowded, often for all-night services, with confession and communion; and it has been noticed that the town congregations have consisted chiefly of educated persons and factory workers, who were earlier among those elements least disposed towards religion. Travellers have also noted the present great activity of the Roman Catholic Church in Russia, which undoubtedly has behind it the keen interest of the Vatican. Meanwhile Stundist (Protestant) missionaries

from America have entered Russia in considerable numbers and are everywhere reporting conversions and urgent requests for the Bible. There has further been noticed a Jewish religious revival among the Jewish population.

Education.

The Government has opened a very large number of primary schools, and illiteracy is rapidly disappearing. These schools are creditably supported and equipped by the local authorities, but they are short of teachers. Secondary schools are in a much worse position, and the programme for remodelling secondary education is as yet by no means completed. This programme is likely to emphasise very strongly professional instruction. In these schools the equipment is very poor, especially of school apparatus and text-books, and the shortage of teachers is severely felt. The Government has opened more than twenty new universities and higher schools, though several of these might hardly be accepted as conforming to the educational standards of the older universities. Several of these institutions are at present closed, largely for lack of Government funds, and the same stress also partly applies to the older universities. Here, too, there is a great shortage of teachers, and there are many more applications than places. Both professors and students receive a ration from the Government. Every university has a Workmen's Faculty, with a course of two or three years as preparation for ordinary university studies. Much the greatest attention is paid to technical schools and faculties.

Currency and Prices.

The enormous fall of the rouble is felt with much the most severity in the towns. 40 lbs. of flour recently cost 2,000,000 to 4,000,000 roubles; 1 lb. of sugar 300,000 roubles; 1 lb. of meat from 50,000 to 100,000 roubles; 1 lb. of butter about 300,000 roubles; a registered letter abroad costs 300,000 roubles; an unregistered letter 150,000 roubles; a cab fare through the whole of Moscow might cost from 300,000 to 500,000 roubles.

Factories and Mines.

The output of factories is at present increasing. The workmen are partly paid with the output of their own work. Their number has sunk to less than a third of pre-war times, and the output often to one-tenth. There is no longer forced labour in the factories, but all skilled workers are registered and obliged, if not incapacitated, to work in one or other institution at their own choice. The output of coal mines is also at present rising. The Donets area has not yet recovered from the civil war with Denikin. Petroleum is being rapidly produced at Baku, but it is found extremely difficult to transport it. Many mines have stopped work for lack of equipment.

Agriculture.

Agriculture is carried on both in separate peasant farms and also in agricultural communes and Soviet agricultural institutions, which have replaced the better cultivated estates of the past. To factories and works throughout the country have been attached considerable grants of land to form allotments for the workmen. A large number of townspeople also possess kitchen gardens. The Communist farms are often in the charge of their previous owners, as employees of the Government. Agriculture might be estimated to produce about 30 per cent. of its pre-war output. Grain

and fodder are the chief products and there has been a great diminution in cotton and flax.

Public Health.

The decrease of purchasable spirit has tended to improve public health, but the famine and the epidemics have had the very worst results, and there has been an enormous mortality. There is now a larger supply of drugs, which are given out only on the receipt of a doctor, and cannot, therefore, be used as preventives. Energetic measures of disinfection are undertaken by the Government, and a vigorous propaganda is conducted in the interests of public cleanliness and health. The shortage of doctors has increased. Those trained since the beginning of the war are seldom more than empirical general practitioners. In the country districts medical assistance is seldom on the level provided before the war by progressive zemstva such as those of Tver, Vyatka, or Samara.

Attitude towards Foreigners.

Many German and Austrian war prisoners have married and settled in Russia. These greatly outnumber the rest of the foreigners from Western Europe. They have their own institutions and clubs, and are treated with courtesy. Their morale is at present higher than that of the Russians, and they are regarded as useful and competent workers for supplying Russian needs. In general, the war has compelled the Russian peasant to understand the value of civilisation and education. The most popular foreigners at present in Russia are the Americans and the Swedes, because of their active part in famine relief.

Genoa.

The Conference of Genoa, as far as Russia was concerned, was largely the product of the internal conditions described above. Certainly at this Conference the Russian people was itself knocking at the doors of Europe; in fact, it was because their situation imperatively demanded it, that the Soviet Government accepted the invitation to the Conference. On the other hand, as the hold of this Government over the detail of life is manifestly decreasing and is giving way to an almost mechanical tendency towards decentralisation, it was least of all in the atmosphere of politics and political theory that the question of Russian reconstruction could be profitably and hopefully discussed. There was, however, no one who could engage the word of the Russian people before Europe except the Soviet Government. The Soviet Government on its side was most anxious to use this opportunity to strengthen its failing control over Russia. This effect would obviously follow if, following the precedent of the Government of the Tsars, which always appropriated to itself so large an initiative in the economic arrangements of the people, the Soviet Government could persuade Europe to deal with Russia only through itself and to entrust to it all the necessary credits. Meanwhile, the more fanatical of the Communists were naturally alarmed at any such concession to ordinary ideas as was involved in the presence of Russian envoys at Genoa and their fraternisation with kings and bourgeois. The more obvious the failure

NOTE.—[The latest news from Russia shows that the recrudescence of the left wing Communists may bring us, in the event of the disappearance of Lenin, to a temporary revival of militant terrorism. We cannot at present see beyond such a crisis, but we are confident that the new currents in Russia which we have described have set in too strongly to be ultimately resisted with success.]

of Communism in Russia, the more difficult was it for them to admit any formal and official compromise of Communist principles, and it is very possibly largely due to the Conference that there has followed a recrudescence of terror inside Russia itself.

This would help to explain why, at the moment when Mr. Chicherin and his colleagues seemed to be successfully bringing a rift into the Entente, he should, after close consultation with Moscow, have been compelled to issue a new manifesto of Communism in the note of 11 May, the result of which was to bring the Allies more together again. On the other hand, the Treaty of Rapallo between Russia and Germany was a sufficiently plain indication of the danger to the Allies of breaking off negotiations.

The most serious criticism that can be levelled against Genoa—apart from the failure to prepare a careful and detailed programme beforehand—was the insistent attempt to represent the Conference as a purely economical and non-political event. The course of the proceedings ruthlessly dispelled any illusion on this point: politics and economics were hopelessly intermingled, and this was all the more fatal because on the Russian side a basis of entirely imaginary economics was laid down. The Conference, as it seems to us, approached the Russian problem from the wrong end. It assumed that the resumption of trade must be initiated by Governments rather than individuals—and this in itself was equivalent to a denial of non-political aims. The result has been to make it abundantly clear that the resumption of trade relations must depend above all upon private initiative: the business men of Europe and America must lead the way, not follow in the train of Prime Ministers and bureaucratic experts. Whether there is a sufficient basis of mutual confidence to make serious trading possible, is a question into which we do not desire to enter here. But the attitude of the United States to the whole problem should be a sufficient indication that something was wrong with the methods and aims of the Genoa Conference.

Russians Abroad.

Over 2,000,000 Russians are now living abroad. They are mostly members of the educated classes, which are peculiarly necessary for the work of Russian reconstruction. The hope of ultimately contributing to this work has prompted among them a strong cultural movement. One of its most notable symptoms is the development of publishing work in Russian in Berlin and, to a less extent, in Prague, Paris, Stockholm and Sofia. Another is the zeal with which the younger generation is everywhere seeking education. For this last-named work Prague is a natural and sympathetic centre. The Czechoslovak Government, with rare insight and sympathy, has created in Prague a Russian university with Russian professors for the education of some 15,000 Russian students. It has also provided a separate university for a lesser number of Ukrainians. Britain has so far done very little in this matter; but a school for Russian children founded in Constantinople by the Russian Relief and Reconstruction Fund has now undertaken the care and education of a thousand more Russian refugee children, in answer to an appeal from the League of Nations, which is providing the necessary buildings and some funds to start the work. The Imperial War Relief Fund (Universities Committee) has made provision for a few Russian students of university age who are continuing their interrupted studies in England, and with the help of the European

Student Relief Committee of the World Student Christian Federation, it is also appealing to students in all the British Universities for contributions which will enable it to send food and clothing to the students in Russia. This appeal has been warmly recommended to the several British Universities by the National Union of Students of the Universities and University Colleges of England and Wales.

Opinions on Russia in Great Britain.

It seems to us that in the past year British opinion on Russia has very much tended to stabilise itself. Communist principles are no longer recommended by any but the merest fragment of the community. The internal policy of the Soviet Government is frankly condemned by practically all the labour leaders in Britain, and is more or less dissociated from the principles of Socialism, which it is felt would only suffer from any identification with the actions and results of Soviet Government. There is, on the other hand, every sign of an increasing interest, quite apart from all political considerations, in the sufferings and destinies of the Russian people. In any case, the number of those persons in Great Britain who are closely interested in Russia and even of those who have had some actual contact with that country is incomparably greater than it was before.

The Political Situation in Jugoslavia.

Ever since the autumn the internal political situation in Jugoslavia has rested on entirely unreal foundations. The government of Mr. Pašić is composed of two political groups, more or less equally balanced and pledged to divergent and well-nigh irreconcilable principles in almost every department of public life. As, however, neither is strong enough to secure a working majority, they have been forced into an unnatural coalition, in which mutual distrust exercises a more and more paralysing influence upon public policy. The link between Radicals and Democrats is the veteran Premier, Mr. Pašić himself, who, at the age of 78, remains a consummate master of opportunist and Fabian tactics, and who latterly has been governing from hand to mouth by an elaborate process of bargaining between the groups and individuals situated along the fringe of the two leading parties. Even in the summer of 1920 he had only secured the bare majority necessary for Parliamentary sanction to the new Constitution by a series of vote-catching concessions. He owes his political survival to the extraordinarily maladroit tactics of the Croat leaders, and in particular of Mr. Radić, the chief of the so-called Peasant Party of Croatia, whose abstention from the Constituent Assembly, so far from furthering their own decentralising and autonomist aims, merely left their political rivals in uncontrolled command at Belgrade, weakened the more progressive elements even in Serbia proper and gave a further lease of life to the old *régime*.

A further effect of their abstention has been to create the highly misleading impression that the central political issue is a straight one between the Serb and the Croat element—an impression which, indeed, injures Jugoslavia's credit abroad by enabling her enemies to spread foolish reports about separatism and impending dissolution of the state, but which in real fact is admirably suited to the party game of Mr. Pašić and a small clique in Belgrade (which, it must be added, though extremely influential both in civilian and military circles, is by no means representative of the real Serbia). They know quite well that their opponents

are not separatists (Croat and Slovene separation being impossible, because there is no country towards which they can gravitate) and thus assured against real trouble, they can watch with equanimity the foolish tactics by which the Opposition presents them with a virtual monopoly of public affairs and notably of administrative appointments.

The Marriage of King Alexander.

For some months past the increasingly virulent charges and counter-charges of party politicians and their press organs have been thrown into the background by an agreeable event of the very first importance in Central European politics. This is, of course, the marriage of King Alexander to Princess Marie of Roumania. The compliments and good wishes lavished on the happy pair on this as on all similar occasions rest upon something much more solid than the adulation of courtiers or hired scribes. No European sovereign—not even King Albert of Belgium—has had to pass through so hard a probation as the long nine years of war, exile, famine, and revolutionary upheaval which commenced barely a month after Prince Alexander's nomination to the Serbian Regency in June, 1914. Certainly no prince in modern times has conducted himself more gallantly or more modestly under such trying circumstances, or has sacrificed more completely his domestic pleasures to the needs of his people in arms. He shares the strictly constitutional and democratic leanings of his father the late King Peter, and is justly proud of his family's unique position among the dynasties of Europe—sprung from a peasant stock and owing its first rise to power solely to superior qualities of leadership in the field and in the council chamber. There can be little doubt that the great-grandson of Kara George, now that he is allied by marriage to most of the surviving dynasties of Europe, will not for that reason alter the democratic simplicity which has become a tradition of the Belgrade Court; and in so doing he will be conforming not only to his own personal feelings, but to the wishes of the overwhelming majority of his subjects in the old no less than in the new territories of Yugoslavia. This is a tradition which Queen Marie, brought up with the sensible ideas of her English mother and known for her charm and simplicity of manner, should have very little difficulty in assimilating.

The Little Entente.

If on the personal side the marriage is intended to strengthen the ties between the sovereigns of two friendly and neighbouring states, which throughout history have never been at war, it must also be taken in its more general aspects as a symbol of that political system known as the Little Entente—which to-day, and more especially since Genoa has exercised its disintegrating effect, is the one solid fact amid the shifting sands of European politics. The wedding celebrations at Belgrade afforded an opportunity for deliberations between the Yugoslav, Roumanian and Czechoslovak Premiers, the first outcome of which has been the conclusion of more explicit and binding agreements between Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia than had previously obtained. This step, which was inherent in the general situation and rendered necessary by facts which completely dwarf all considerations of internal party politics, is also the first answer to a tendency noticeable in certain British and Italian circles during the Genoa Conference (we must not of course

be taken as crediting either British or Italian policy as a whole with such ill-considered plans) to deprecate the consolidation of the Little Entente and even represent it as inimical. There are of course certain shortsighted politicians in London, in Rome, and in Paris alike, who would like to subordinate the Little Entente to their own particularist and temporary aims, or even to break its solidarity, in order thereby to escape the need of treating with it as a factor of the first magnitude. But even they cannot shut their eyes permanently to the fact that it *is* more and more such a factor, and that its continuance makes for peace, security and in the main democratic progress throughout the central portions of the continent. They would do well to remember also that any attempts of sabotage directed against the Little Entente are not merely under present circumstances a crime against European peace, but so long as they are mainly inspired from the present quarter, are almost automatically bound to produce the opposite effect of bringing the individual states of the Little Entente more closely together. Even so discreet a statesman as Dr. Beneš allowed this to show between the lines when, in an interview with "The Times" correspondent at Zagreb on June 11, he referred to the consolidating effect of the new treaty, and added, "we wish to show that we have the will and the power to manage our own affairs." The root fault of European diplomacy to-day is the arbitrary tendency of certain Powers to dictate matters of major policy to the smaller Powers, to place them in categories of the second and third rank, and only too often to make decisions on matters that directly and vitally concern them, without even troubling to consult them.

The Foreign Policy of Czechoslovakia.

Special reference ought to be made to the very full speech on foreign policy delivered by Dr. Beneš in the Czechoslovak Parliament on 23 May, after his return from Genoa. He dwelt in great detail on the Russian problem, describing as "positively grotesque" the fact that the Soviet delegates, "after sharply criticising the old Europe and proving that it was condemned to destruction, asked for money from the same old Europe in order to save themselves . . . Thus at Genoa the Soviet *régime* paid eloquent testimony *volens nolens* to its own defeat." He went on to argue that "a real agreement" between Europe and Soviet Russia can only be reached by one path, namely, "the open admission by the Soviets, that Russia no longer stands on the logical communist standpoint, but is adapting itself to the rest of the world," and that it must reach compromises not only with Europe, but "above all in its home policy, with the mass of the non-communist population." Russia at Genoa has really obtained *de facto* recognition, but "is not yet a strong economic factor, and cannot be for a long time, even if it resumes economic co-operation with Europe." The Prague Government has always favoured non-intervention in Russia and opposed her isolation; it will continue to negotiate, "without of course violating those principles of solidarity which have always led us in our relations with the other European states, and especially our allies." Dr. Beneš then condemned with equal emphasis the rival policies hitherto adopted towards Russia—on the one hand "the refusal, on principle, of any contact with the Soviets as Government," and on the other, the tendency "to accept unreservedly—without sufficient knowledge of the

Russian situation, without understanding the psychology of the Russian Revolution or Russian Bolshevism—the recognition of the Soviets, and co-operation with them” . . . “ We defended the policy of a middle course. We were for entering into relations, for permanent contact and co-operation step by step especially in the economic sphere; for gradual development and the preservation of the very serious achievements of the Russian Revolution, without producing widespread anarchy in Russia . . . In our view this is the only possible path for the rest of Europe also. The first policy takes for granted a new upheaval and new struggles in Russia; the second fails to see that it is outpacing events, that by its abrupt attitude it makes every compromise impossible for the adherents of the first, increases the chaos in the mentality of the working classes and postpones the necessary decision of principle between communism and socialism.”

It is much to be regretted that Dr. Beneš's very enlightening survey of Franco-British relations and the so-called “ crisis of alliances ” has not been reproduced in the British press : space does not permit us to quote it here. As for his own policy, he had been asked “ whether it would follow a French or an English line. Some spoke of vassalage towards France, others again disapproved of our Russian policy. We were neither Russo-phil nor Francophil enough for them, and we were even described as Germanophil.” In reality his policy had always been “ Czechoslovak.” It rests on democratic progress and the maintenance of the peace treaties : it is opposed to competition in armaments and favours full rights for the minorities. “ Every small state must take account of the attitude of the big states and in some degree act accordingly ” : but Czechoslovakia “ cannot bind itself beyond the interests of its own state ”—not even towards the Russia of the future—nor can this be regarded as in any way anti-Slav, but “ on the contrary a preliminary condition to a serious and positive Slav policy.”

Dr. Beneš referred to “ the strengthening of the international political influence of the Little Entente and of Poland,” as “ one of the positive results of the Conference of Genoa.” He claimed too that it had exercised a moderating influence upon Franco-British differences, and also in the question of the Russian Memorandum, having worked to prevent the renewal of complete Russian isolation.

He formulated very clearly the main criticisms levelled against the Conference, and by refraining—it would seem, deliberately—from any real attempt to refute them, he may be said to have given them his endorsement, even though he was careful to lay equal stress upon “ the endurance, big conceptions and optimism of Mr. Lloyd George ” and upon “ the scepticism of French policy,” which events too big for human control showed to be “ not ungrounded.” “ Though the aims set by the organisers of the Conference were not attained, none the less very important results were reached, sometimes of a very unexpected kind.” Nothing in the whole speech is more significant than his failure to follow up this phrase by any attempt at explanation : and it may fairly be taken as intended for *foreign* consumption.

The speech must be interpreted in the light of fundamental principles of foreign policy laid down by President Masaryk and Dr. Beneš. Only second among these to the maintenance of the new territorial settlement of Europe, is the determination of the Little Entente, and Czecho-

slovakia in particular, not to take sides as between France and Britain. They realise more clearly than many foolish people in our own island, that the two Ententes, despite obvious shortcomings, represent the only solid ground in Europe to-day, and that their weakening or disappearance is ardently desired by all the forces of reaction and disorder. In this desire extreme Right or extreme Left meet, not for the first time.

Higher Education in Czechoslovakia.

The following table indicates the number of students and teachers at the Universities and other seats of higher learning on 1 January, 1921. There are to-day four Universities:—two Czech at Prague and Brno (Brünn), one Slovak at Bratislava (Pressburg), one German at Prague. There are also four technical high schools (2 Czech, 2 German) enjoying university rank, as well as three distinct faculties of theology—at Prague, Olomouc (Olmütz) and Bratislava (the latter still in suspense until the problem of the Slovak bishoprics can be finally regulated with the Vatican) and 2 Magyar Academies of Law at Bratislava and Košice (Kaschau).

	STUDENTS.			TEACHERS.
	Men.	Women.	Total.	
Caroline University, Prague (1348) -	7,208	1,562	8,770	381
German University, Prague (1882) -	3,274	394	3,668	267
Masaryk University, Brno (1918) -	1,092	152	1,244	116
Komenský University, Bratislava (1919) - - - - -	219	28	247	77
Academy of Arts, Prague - -	239	44	283	18
Law Academies, Košice and Bratislava - - - - -	448	13	461	?
Czech Technical High School, Prague	6,128	193	6,321	303
" " Brno -	1,466	106	1,572	121
German " Prague	2,205	45	2,250	126
Czech " Brno -	2,170	36	2,206	118
Mining High School, Píbram -	432	—	432	43
High School of Agriculture and Forestry, Brno - - - -	445	2	447	12
Veterinary High School, Brno -	423	2	425	46
Theological Faculties, Prague and Olomouc - - - - -	110	6	116	25
Total - - - -	25,859	2,583	28,442	1,657

These students were divided according to their studies as follows:—Law, 5,787 (including 374 women); Medicine, 5,277 (744); Chemistry, 259 (64); Philosophy, 2,981 (965); engineering, 1,630 (12); architecture, 589 (17); electrical engineering, 4,008 (12); applied chemistry, 2,161 (94); other applied sciences, 1,081 (161); agriculture, 1,108 (26); forestry, 387 (0); mining, 535 (0); veterinary science, 425 (2); commerce, 1,729 (60); fine arts, 283 (44); theology, 202 (6).

ECONOMIC NOTES.

A.—RUSSIA.

We are indebted to the "Russian Economic Association in London" (30, Bedford Square, W.C.1) for the following statistical tables bearing upon existing trade conditions.

I.—THE INCREASE IN RETAIL PRICES IN MOSCOW.

(This table is taken from *Soyuz Potrebiteley*, Moscow, April, 1922.)

Items.	Pre-war, year, 1913, in kopeks.	1st January 1922,	1st April, 1922,	Percentage of the third column	
				to first.	to second.
		in thousand roubles			
Salt - - 1 lb.	0.5	10	42.5	850,000,000	425
Sugar, Lump 1 lb.	13	102.5	693.7	530,000,000	677
Sugar, Granul. 1 lb.	12	77.5	293.5	250,000,000	392
Flour, Wheat 1 pud	200	1,050	5,400	270,000,000	514
Buckwheat - 1 lb.	4	16.5	195	490,000,000	1.181
Sunflower oil 1 lb.	12	48	650	540,000,000	1.354
Wheat - 1 pud	105	405	3,600	343,000,000	888
Rye - 1 pud	83	310	3,412.5	420,000,000	1.100
Millet - - 1 lb.	4	14.5	165	412,500,000	1.138
Barley - 1 pud	95	330	2,500	260,000,000	757
Flax seed oil 1 lb.	11	36	443.75	400,000,000	1.233
Flour, Rye 1 pud	110	355	3,687.5	335,000,000	1.039
Lard (Ukrainian) 1 lb.	27	77.5	875	320,000,000	1.129
Kerosene 1 lb.	4	11	50	125,000,000	455
Oats - 1 pud	85	230	2,475	290,000,000	1.076
Pork - 1 lb.	20	50	618.75	310,000,000	1.237
Beef-fat - - 1 lb.	22	55	668.75	310,000,000	1.216
Bread, Rye - 1 lb.	3	7.5	85	280,000,000	1.133
Peas - - 1 lb.	4	10	108.75	270,000,000	1.087
Chintz - 1 arshin	15	35.5	248.75	170,000,000	701
Thread - 1 reel	7	15.5	120	170,000,000	774
Soap, Washing 1 lb.	12	26.5	437	365,000,000	1.650
Matches - 1 box	1	2	11.5	115,000,000	575
Top boots 1 pair	650	1,250	13,000	200,000,000	1.040
Tea - - 1 lb.	146	275	2,137.5	146,000,000	777
Mutton - - 1 lb.	17	30	393.75	230,000,000	1.312
Potatoes - - 1 lb.	1	1.75	20	200,000,000	1.143
Milk - 1 jug	7	12	51.25	73,210,000	427
Butter, Cream 1 lb.	50	80	800	160,000,000	1.000
Sack, New 1 piece	25	40	318.75	127,500,000	797
Butter, Russian 1 lb.	47	67.5	843.75	180,000,000	1.250
Meat (beef) - 1 lb.	20	21.5	318.7	160,000,000	1.482
Makhoyka (coarse tobacco) ½ lb.	4	3.5	44.38	110,900,000	1.268
Axe - 1 piece	100	80	941.25	94,100,000	1.177
Tumbler - 1 piece	25	15	68.125	27,250,000	454
Gold ten roubles	1,000	1,450	9,600	96,000,000	662

II.—RUSSIAN INDUSTRY.

Output in 1913, 1920, 1921, and in the first two months of 1922.

(Total output in thousands of puds.)

	1913.	1920.	1921.	January 1922.	February 1922.
Coal - - - -	1,777,800	471,496	539,024	61,643	63,076
Oil - - - -	564,300	250,639	244,054	22,6	21,5
Iron ore - - -	572,537	9,817	8,470	602	850
Pig iron - - -	257,400	6,331	7,028	931	875
Gold puds - - -	3,714	106	No	information.	
Cotton yarn - -	22,708	831	1,121	277	288
Linen yarn - - -	4,165 ¹	806	498	93,7	111
Woollen yarn - -	2,400	491	408	61,4	65

¹ 1916.

III.—FOREIGN TRADE IN 1921 AND THE FIRST TWO MONTHS OF 1922.

Grouped *Imports* in puds.

	1st six months.	3rd quarter.	4th quarter.	Total for 1921.	1922.	
					January.	February.
Foodstuffs -	4,220,113	8,113,559	7,708,019	20,041,691	1,461,000	2,396,000
Animal pro- ducts -	490,045	83,352	95,598	668,995	5,000	21,000
Wooden goods and seeds -	701,186	56,301	35,642	793,129	334,000	273,000
Pottery -	6,373	9,173	60,923	76,469	29,000	—
Fuel, tar -	2,031,071	9,565,249	4,801,647	16,397,967	1,264,000	932,000
Chemical products	338,386	132,650	138,927	609,963	30,000	33,000
Metal and metal goods	2,475,862	5,208,697	3,464,029	11,148,588	492,000	248,000
Paper and printed matter -	554,543	369,325	840,410	1,764,278	299,000	313,000
Spinning materials -	283,483	146,506	168,688	598,677	7,000	17,000
Articles of clothing -	61,960	5,238	4,905	72,103	9,000	4,000
Various goods	203,974	527,355	2,401,026	3,132,355	1,534,000	4,366,000
Total -	11,366,007	24,217,405	19,718,704	55,305,116	5,464,000	8,567,000

These tables are compiled from *Ekonomicheskaya Zhizn* (*Economic Life*), Moscow, official: but some totals do not agree.

Grouped *Exports* in puds.

	1st six months.	3rd quarter.	4th quarter.	Total for 1921.	1922.	
					January.	February.
Foodstuffs -	16,119	231,462	191,080	538,661	18,000	16,000
Raw materials and semi-manufactured goods -	2,437,731	2,747,557	7,157,871	12,343,159	1,015,000	185,000
Animal products -	—	—	5,637	5,637	—	—
Manufactured goods -	4,013	674	25,454	30,141	4,000	4,000
Total	2,602,863	2,979,693	7,380,042	12,962,592	1,037,000	205,000

The value of Imports and Exports in pre-war prices in gold roubles.

	1921.			1922.	
	October.	November.	December.	January.	February.
Imports - - -	27,080,950	12,406,317	22,388,000	12,595,000	16,315,000
Exports - - -	3,675,172	3,110,550	4,225,000	2,492,000	1,675,000
Total	30,756,122	15,516,867	26,683,000	15,087,000	17,990,000

Imports from Great Britain in puds and in gold roubles.

	October.	November.	December.	January.	February.
In puds - - -	2,916,000	4,027,000	945,000	1,226,000	1,330,000
In gold roubles -	No information.			3,095,000	1,385,000

B.—CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

I.—FOREIGN TRADE.

The following are the definite figures relating to Czechoslovak foreign trade for 1920 and 1921 :—

	In million Czech crowns.		In million metric quintals.	
	1920.		1921.	
Total imports - - -	23,384	39·1	39·6	
Total exports - - -	27,569	69·0	96·4	
Favourable balance - - -	4,269	29·9	56·8	

According to countries, the foreign trade was distributed as follows:

		Imports. In million metric Czech quintals. crowns.		Exports. In million metric Czech quintals. crowns.		Imports. Exports. In million metric quintals.	
		1920.				1921.	
Germany	-	20.7	5,601	30.8	3,330	18.8	35.9
Austria	-	3.2	3,043	23.9	9,678	3.1	33.0
U.S.A.	-	2.0	4,110	0.2	544	3.7	0.2
Hungary	-	0.8	655	3.2	2,512	2.4	13.2
France	-	0.2	954	1.9	2,373	0.3	1.7
and	-	1.0	399	1.7	1,425	1.4	3.5
Italy	-	0.5	1,002	1.7	1,300	0.8	1.4
Holland	-	0.6	1,316	0.6	557	0.8	0.7
Belgium	-	0.8	1,036	0.08	134	0.3	0.2
Great Britain	-	0.3	1,008	0.2	813	0.9	1.5
Roumania	-	0.5	308	0.3	732	0.8	0.8
Jugoslavia	-	0.1	340	0.6	1,081	0.6	1.3
Switzerland	-	0.1	625	0.9	766	0.06	0.7

The largest items were the following :—

Corn, flour, &c.	2.46	2,300	0.86	731	7.82	0.35
Cotton, yarn, &c.	0.69	5,029	0.10	2,525	0.94	0.32
Wool, yarn, &c.	0.19	2,211	0.10	6,683	0.29	0.12
Sugar	0.05	11	2.48	3,405	0.02	4.47
Iron, iron goods	1.14	929	1.63	1,511	1.27	1.99
Fats	0.46	1,080	0.04	110	0.43	0.08
Coal, timber	13.19	520	51.84	1,740	11.33	76.32
Glass	0.02	49	1.40	1,898	0.01	1.32
Fruits, veget- ables	1.29	681	0.89	909	1.05	0.69
Paper	0.19	225	0.76	695	0.09	0.78
Leather and leather goods	0.02	366	0.02	642	0.03	0.05

Although the figures relating to value for 1921 are not yet known, it is evident from the statistics based upon quantity that even if substantial allowance is made for the reduction in prices, the balance will, as in 1920, be a favourable one.

II.—AGRICULTURE.

The following preliminary figures, relating to the harvest for 1921, have just been published by the Statistical Office :—

		Area under cultivation in thousands of hectares.		Yield per hectare in quintals.		Crops in thousands of metric quintals.	
		1921.	1920.	1921.	1920.	1921.	1920.
Wheat	-	622	636	17.9	11.3	11,069	7,174
Corn	-	883	904	15.8	9.4	13,813	8,367

Barley	-	-	640	694	13·3	11·6	10,312	8,107
Oats	-	-	810	801	13·0	10·8	10,501	8,658
Maize	-	-	146	152	18·1	16·4	2,667	2,450
							48,362	34,756

The general improvement is clearly indicated by the figures relating to yield per hectare.

III.—THE SUGAR INDUSTRY.

The following statistics dealing with the production and export of Czechoslovak sugar have been published by the Czechoslovak Sugar Syndicate :—

					Raw sugar in metric quintals.	
					1921-22.	1920-21.
Stock on 1st October	-	-	-	-	290,900	445,660
Production	-	-	-	-	6,513,070	6,916,730
					6,803,970	7,362,390
Home consumption in the period from						
October to March	-	-	-	-	1,411,240	1,417,610
Exports in the same period	-	-	-	-	1,999,710	720,200
Stock on 1st March	-	-	-	-	3,393,020	5,155,580

As will be seen, this year's exports show an increase of $1\frac{1}{4}$ million quintals over those of the previous year, while the stocks are lower by $1\frac{3}{4}$ million quintals. The total purchases for abroad amount to 3 million quintals. Allowing for about $1\frac{3}{4}$ million quintals which will be required for home consumption during the remaining part of the season, only 500 to 600,000 quintals are available for export.

IV.—RAILWAY STATISTICS.

The total length of Czechoslovak railways is 13,031 km., of which 86·6 per cent. is managed by the State and the rest by private companies. The share of the respective provinces is as follows :—Bohemia, 6,777 km. (1 km. per 893 inhabitants); Moravia, 2,218 km. (1 km. per 1,199 inhabitants); Slovakia, 3,504 km. (1 km. per 1,207 inhabitants). On an average Czechoslovakia has 1 km. railways per 1,040 inhabitants. The number of sleepers on all the railways is 23,323,000, or 1,285 sleepers per km. The maximum height above sea-level is 999 metres (Bohemian Forest); the minimum, 97 metres, in the district of Bratislava. The number of bridges exceeding two metres in length is 8,639; viaducts, 162; tunnels and cuttings, 155, etc. The State railways have 1,673 stations and 1,102 other stopping-places; the railways under private management, 196 stations and 183 other stopping-places. At the moment of the Armistice Czechoslovakia had a shortage of 1,200 locomotives and 70,000 carriages and trucks. In the last three years, however, over 30,000 waggons have been built, and these, together with about the same number of carriages received from Austria-Hungary in accordance with the terms of the Peace Treaty, have greatly contributed towards the improvement of traffic conditions, which are rapidly approaching the normal standard.

REVIEWS.

Alexander von Battenberg: sein Kampf mit den Zaren und Bismarck.

By E. C. Corti. Vienna (L. W. Seidel), 1920. pp. 352. Illustrations and facsimiles.

So far as I am aware, this book, though published over a year ago, has passed entirely unnoticed in the British Press, and yet no political biography of recent times throws such a flood of light upon the diplomatic history of Europe in the decade following the Treaty of Berlin and upon the personal relations of the sovereigns and statesmen of that period. Its author, who writes in German and from Vienna, is a grand-nephew of Count Luigi Corti, who, as Italian Foreign Minister, represented his country at the Berlin Congress of 1878, and afterwards for a number of years as Ambassador in Constantinople. He himself is a pupil of Professor Pribram (to whom we owe the well-known work on the Triple Alliance and its subsidiary treaties): and his work is based upon the family papers of the late Prince Alexander, placed at his disposal by the latter's widow Countess Hartenau, and also upon many unpublished documents from the Viennese archives. The book is a very careful piece of work, though the style is not inspired and though the value of footnote references is often seriously impaired by the omission of dates. It most certainly ought to be translated into English.

The selection of Prince Alexander for the new-baked throne of Bulgaria represented a compromise between various dynastic interests. His father was a Hessian Prince and an Austrian General; his mother was a Pole, Countess Hauke; his aunt was Russian Empress (wife of Alexander II.); while his brothers Louis and Henry were already in close relations with the British royal family, which were soon to be strengthened by marriage. He himself was only 22, and, being as yet uncommitted to any special political view, seemed acceptable on all sides. But though subject to waves of pessimism, he was a man of energetic character and considerable political *flair*; and the reader of this book cannot fail to be struck by the rapidity with which (to judge by the documents quoted) he grasped the salient features of the Balkan situation at a time when the rival arbiters of Europe were working on utterly false lines. The Berlin settlement of 1878 he roundly described as "a monstrous monument of European diplomatic ignorance"; and it is instructive to find that similar views, though in a less truculent form, were held by Prince Charles of Roumania, who wrote to Alexander in July, 1879, affirming his belief in a future

"Great Bulgaria," and adding, "The diplomats with all their tricks and arts cannot hold up the course of events" (p. 48).

There are several sidelights on Bismarck's well-known contempt for Disraeli's policy, and it is therefore all the more interesting to learn from a letter of the German Crown Princess (Empress Frederick) to Prince Alexander in 1885, that Disraeli in conversation with her during the Congress, admitted that the East Roumelian settlement could not last more than seven years (p. 46). But the more we are inclined to credit Disraeli with prophetic insight rather than a mere lucky guess, the more severe must be our verdict on his tactics at Berlin. Alexander, at any rate, went to his new post without illusions, and in a conversation of three and a half hours with Count AndrÁssy in Vienna, declared that he would respect the Treaty of Berlin "until the moment when this should no longer prove possible." The separation, he argued, could not be permanently enforced, and was merely due to "Disraeli's inadequate knowledge of the qualities and aims of the Bulgarian people" (p. 64).

The arrogant attitude adopted by the Russian civil and military administrators of Bulgaria after the liberation was from the very outset a matter of notoriety throughout Europe: but these pages illustrate still more clearly the extreme friction which arose between them and the young Prince. He describes Prince Dondukov-Korsakov as "a Nihilist in general's uniform," and we soon find him wiring to his father, "all the Russians, except Davydov, have behaved abominably (*gemein*) towards me" (p. 81). In conversation with Count KÁlnoky (then still Austro-Hungarian Ambassador in St. Petersburg) he went even further: his words, as reported to Vienna, ran thus: "I can't trust a single one of the Russian officers and officials who are sent to me, and this is quite natural, for every Russian who comes here has to choose whether he will serve the Panslav War Minister Milyutin and the Slav committee, or me. Naturally he opts against me." Indeed, one Russian officer was frank enough to tell him to his face: "Your disfavour is for me the best recommendation in Russia." When the Prince again visited St. Petersburg after the assassination of Alexander II. (March, 1881), he told the new Tsar that the Bulgarian administration was "corrupt from the highest official to the last gendarme." During a later visit, in 1882, he denounced the Russian agents in Bulgaria as "*perfid und niedertrÁchtig*" in their attitude towards him (p. 121): and in 1883 he talks of his new subjects' "glowing hate against Russia," and of their "forgetting too soon what Russia did for them." In the autumn of that year he writes to the German Crown Prince Frederick, "Russia hates me because it fears me, but I am pleased at this hate, which I return from the depths of my soul, even though conditions force me to control my feelings for a few years longer" (p. 146). As these and other extracts show, tact can hardly have been his strongest point, and though we must allow for acute provocation from Russia, especially from his cousin Alexander III. and his intriguing

minister Giers, there can be little doubt that the Prince's personal attitude contributed materially to the misunderstanding. Moreover, if the Russians were overbearing, a prime motive of their action was a belief, not altogether unpardonable in the circumstances, in the political unripeness of the Bulgarians; and this belief the Prince fully shared, revealing his arbitrary tendencies by a reference to the various Bulgarian parties as "equally democratic and unreliable." This outlook found practical expression in his dismissal of seven Cabinets and three Chambers within two years.

His position was, of course, one of extreme difficulty, for Bulgaria in the eighties was a mere catspaw between the Great Powers, each of which was primarily concerned with undermining the position and prestige of its rival. Kálnoky, now Austro-Hungarian Foreign Minister, aimed simultaneously at checking Russia's influence in the Near East and at maintaining the Russian Court's traditional relations with Vienna and Berlin—a combination which involved much tortuous manœuvring. To Bismarck, Bulgaria was above all an embarrassment and the efforts of Prince and people towards the elimination of foreign control left him entirely cold. His famous phrase about the bones of a Pomeranian grenadier represented the genuine feelings both of the Chancellor and of the old Emperor, who were wedded to the dynastic friendship of Prussia and Russia, and at the same time obsessed by the dangers which its dissolution might easily bring down upon Germany. This was, of course, a commonplace of diplomatic knowledge until William II.'s world policy undermined the old relationship: but it may be doubted whether any published records illustrate it so clearly as the full accounts which we now obtain of Prince Alexander's interviews with William I. and Bismarck in April, 1884—after the Hessian wedding of Prince Louis, and at a moment when the League of the three Emperors had again become a reality. On this occasion the Emperor advised Alexander to make his submission to the Tsar, and argued in some detail that ever since the days of Peter the Great Russia had sought free access to the Mediterranean and would therefore sweep aside any obstacle which might place itself across her path. The Prince replied that when Europe sent him to Bulgaria, "it had been with the instructions to maintain the Berlin settlement," and for the rest "Bulgaria for the Bulgarians," and the existing friction with Russia was the result. He defended himself from the Emperor's reproach of falling into debt to international Jewry by arguing that his sole alternative was to become "a Russian pensioner"—to which came the prompt reply that that would have been preferable. When finally Alexander declared that, failing any backing from German policy, he should be driven to abdicate, William I. simply answered: "Very well, go: that won't disturb me" (*mich wird es nicht stören*). The same day Bismarck spoke with even greater bluntness, and defined his policy in the phrase, "Germany has no interest in Bulgaria, our interest is peace with Russia" (pp. 165-7).

For the remainder of his reign Alexander found himself equally unsupported by St. Petersburg, Berlin and Vienna : what alone made this supportable was the increasing encouragement of Britain, who, after having done more than any other Power to wreck the San Stefano settlement and to restore Eastern Roumelia to the Turks, adopted a diametrically opposite policy from the moment that the Bulgars and their Prince showed themselves refractory to Russian influence. Unfortunately there is nothing to show that British policy saw in Bulgaria anything more than an anti-Russian pawn : the most that can be said is that its calculations rested on a sound estimate of the new nation's powers of recuperation and resistance, and an early perception of the extent to which nationality was to dominate Balkan politics in the future.

The purely selfish outlook of Russia and Britain alike towards the Balkans is strikingly revealed by their sudden exchange of *rôles* in 1884. Giers had pursued the perfidious policy of secretly fanning the Union movement in Bulgaria, while all the time denouncing the Prince to Berlin and Vienna for his alleged support of this very movement : but this ended in the Russian Minister and his master the Tsar finding themselves committed—very largely out of personal animus against Prince Alexander—to a public pronouncement against that Union, the foundations for which had been cemented with Russian blood.

This *volteface* of the Tsar was followed by one no less sudden on the part of Britain, who set herself openly to favour Bulgarian expansion. Queen Victoria in particular showed keen personal interest in the fate of Prince Alexander, was indignant at Gladstone's Russophilism and urged upon Salisbury the need of strengthening the Balkan States as a buffer against Russia. The intensity of feeling at the British Court may be judged from a letter addressed by Queen Victoria to Prince Alexander after the kidnapping of the latter by the Russophile party in 1886. In it she assures her "poor dear Sandro" (*du lieber armer Sandro*) of "my indignation and fury against your barbarous Asiatic tyrannous cousin" (*meine Empörung und Wut gegen deinen barbarischen asiatischartigen tyrannischen Vetter*)—namely, Tsar Alexander III.—and adds that "my Government will do all it can to win the Powers against Russia and for you" (p. 266, reproduced in facsimile). When the Prince returned in triumph to Sofia, only to reveal his lost nerve and play into the Tsar's hand by a telegram offering abdication, the Queen at once sent an urgent wire (4th September, 1886) : "I am speechless, and beseech you to undo this step. After such triumphs this was unworthy of the great position you had won. You are blamed for telegraphing to the Tsar, *instead of applying here for advice*" (p. 274). Alexander adhered to his resolve to abdicate, but sent to the Queen a reasoned explanation of his motives, which elicited the following illuminating reply : "I could weep tears of blood, to be unable to do more for you, but England is so bound and tied by her Parliament and the various parties, that the Government are blocked in everything : but we do

what we can and try to come to an arrangement with Austria " (p. 286). What steps the Queen might have taken if left to herself, must remain a matter of conjecture : but that they would have been drastic, may be inferred from the fact that she could write thus disparagingly in October of Ministers who only in August had gone the length of instructing their Ambassador in St. Petersburg to characterise the kidnapping of the Prince as pointless and dangerous, and to announce that a Russian occupation of Bulgaria might be followed by the despatch of the British fleet to the Black Sea !

Prince Alexander was not merely quick to detect the unsound basis upon which the Berlin settlement rested, but his general views of Balkan policy were far-sighted in the extreme. In his mind the idea of a Balkan League had already taken shape, and during a visit to King Charles in the summer of 1886 he uttered the prophetic phrase that the mistaken policy of Greece and Serbia towards the Bulgarian Union had set back the natural development of the Peninsula by whole decades (p. 259). In 1883 he expressed to his Austrian confidant, Baron Biegeleben, the opinion that the Eastern question would be in a fair way towards solution on the day when Serbia, Greece and Bulgaria agreed regarding the future political geography of the Balkans (p. 134). Of unusual interest in this connection is the correspondence which passed in 1884 between the Prince and King Milan of Serbia, who pleaded for close mutual support, since " the peoples of this Peninsula have the habit of changing sovereigns as they change shirts " (p. 174). Unhappily the close understanding which they desired to see established between their respective countries was frustrated by narrow party interests, and above all by the intrigues of the Russian party agent Koyander, who incited the Bulgarian Premier Karavelov against Serbia. Milan's unbalanced and passionate nature emerges from this correspondence. He habitually spoke of the Russians as "*ces canailles*," and when Alexander intimated to him the rejection of their joint project by the Bulgarian Cabinet, he sent him a diatribe of fifteen pages in length, culminating in the passage : " Don't count on your Bulgars, don't believe them to be good and *naïv*. They are Slavs, and that says everything. My Serbs are not worth any more " (p. 177). In a later letter he warned Alexander against abdication. " Remain ! " he wrote. " I, too, was Russia's slave and Turkey's vassal, and am no longer either " (January, 1885). But within a short year the fickle Milan had thrown all professions of friendship and co-operation to the winds, and, rejecting Alexander's suggestion for joint action against the Turks (30 September), plunged into a war of aggression against Bulgaria. This, the most shameful episode in modern Serbian history, both as regards its motives and its outcome, reveals Austria-Hungary as playing the same game of intrigue as was to prove her eventual ruin. As in 1914 she encouraged Bulgaria against Serbia, so in 1885 she directly incited Serbia against Bulgaria. On 14 November we find Count Kálnoky writing to his Minister in

Belgrade, Count Khevenhüller: "The King's decision to invade could not surprise us. We wish Serbia the best of success; indeed, we have for some weeks past been busy preparing the Powers for the event" (p. 219). A week later, when the Serbs were already in retreat, he admits very frankly to the same agent, "we are hard hit by this military collapse of Serbia, whose cause we espoused" (p. 224).

There was, however, one essential difference between the two crises: unlike his feeble successor in office, Bismarck did all he could to discourage Austria-Hungary. He warned Vienna against King Milan—"this unreliable, haphazard and sensual man"—and refused to see what advantages could accrue to the Dual Monarchy from backing Serbia, whose further rise to power was bound to coincide with a growth of irredentism (p. 245). With even more than his usual foresight, he insisted that Vienna must never risk a breach with Russia, "relying solely upon Germany, and without guarantees for the attitude of the two Western Powers." For "in that case we might, according to the situation in England and France, open up the way for a Russo-Anglo-French Coalition, in face of which the situation of the two allied Imperial Courts might be a difficult one, and Italy's reliability might prove doubtful" (p. 246). He himself never veered from his original attitude of extreme reserve towards all Balkan complications: "To us it is a matter of complete indifference who rules in Bulgaria and what becomes of her . . . Russia's friendship is worth more to us than Bulgaria's" (p. 293). Kálnoky, on the other hand, already held the superficial view proclaimed by Bethmann-Hollweg on the eve of the Great War: for in 1888, in a confidential circular to his representatives abroad, he treats as inevitable a conflict between Russia and the two Central Empires, "to decide whether Slav Russia is to dominate the Continent" (p. 316).

Running through the whole volume and intricately interwoven with the high European policy of the eighties, is the love-story of Prince Alexander and Princess Victoria of Prussia, granddaughter of Queen Victoria and sister of William II.—here laid before the reader in all its pathetic detail. For over four years their marriage is canvassed to and fro between the Courts of Berlin, St. Petersburg and London, and an insurmountable obstacle is always found in the violent and even brutal personal dislike shown by Tsar Alexander III. towards his namesake of Bulgaria, and in the consequent refusal of William I. and Bismarck to jeopardise their good relations with Russia by sanctioning a marriage which the Tsar would undoubtedly have interpreted as an attempt to oust Russian for German influence in the Near East. In April, 1884, Bismarck warned the Prince that the Imperial consent would be immediately followed by his own resignation of the Chancellorship; and the unhappy Alexander was torn between his ardent devotion to the Princess and his fear of the devastating political consequences which their union might conjure up. Bismarck, with blunt and studied insolence, advised him to marry outside

Royalty, or, if he was bent upon this, to look rather to Princess Beatrice of England (so soon to be his sister-in-law) or Princess Helena of Mecklenburg. But, best of all, he added, would be the daughter of some Orthodox millionaire, for "in the East ruling means palm-oil" (*Regieren heisst Schmieren*). In March, 1885, under Bismarck's influence, the Emperor William, who had never favoured the match, insisted upon an explicit renunciation by Alexander, arguing in a pompously hostile letter that "the maintenance of my political and family relations to H.M. the Emperor of Russia is one of the noblest which my monarchical calling imposes on me, according to God's will" (p. 182). But in the meantime the Prince had found powerful allies for the cause of the marriage in the Crown Princess and her mother Queen Victoria. Their enthusiasm for Prince Alexander knew no bounds: and after the annexation of Eastern Roumelia the Queen bombarded Lord Salisbury with wires and letters in his interest (p. 213), refused Kálnoky's request that she should exercise a moderating influence at Sofia during the war with Serbia, and after the *coup d'état* of 1886 held a family consultation with Prince Henry of Battenberg and wrote letters in his brother's interest up till two in the morning (p. 266). Alexander himself was sufficiently discouraged to desist, but as Count Wedell reminded him during a conversation (when sent as intermediary to discuss Bulgarian problems, August, 1885) "the Queen of England wishes this marriage at all costs" (p. 187). The zeal and enthusiasm with which the Crown Princess, thus encouraged by her mother, worked for the marriage, is illustrated by a letter of 28 pages which she wrote to Alexander after the Union. In it she tells him that "Vicky" wanted to dress up as a man and join Alexander in the campaign against Serbia, "but then Berlin might regard this as the fruit of my (English) education!" She won her husband's passive approval for the match and reckoned that the death of the old Emperor, which could not long be delayed, would remove the last obstacle. But Bismarck proved too strong for her; their personal conflict only accentuated his disapproval of the match, in which he now saw an English intrigue, calculated to drive a wedge between Germany and Russia: and he found a valuable ally in Prince William, who endorsed his grandfather's views on the subject and threatened to make his sister's position intolerable if she dared to marry against his wish. Bismarck's attitude throughout was both logical and comprehensible, but there is a peculiarly unsympathetic tone in the letter addressed by the future William II. to Alexander, declaring that "I shall regard everyone who helps on such a union as an enemy to all time, not only of my house but also of my country, and will treat him accordingly: and I hope Your Highness will not bring me into the position of having to class you in this category." Even more offensive was the attitude of Prince Henry of Prussia, whose clumsy words of intervention were carefully recorded by Alexander after a painful interview in May, 1887. The Empress Frederick did her

best to effect the betrothal during her husband's brief reign, but her two sons' active opposition was even more fatal than all previous obstacles, and even Queen Victoria reluctantly warned her not to move without William's consent. With the latter's accession all hope was at an end, and Prince Alexander, who had already withdrawn into the strictest privacy, married in 1889 an actress of the Darmstadt Court Theatre, and was allowed to assume the title of Count of Hartenau. His death in 1893, at the age of 37, ended prematurely and in a strange *cul-de-sac* a life which had seemed destined to leave its mark upon the fate of Europe.

I have dwelt in great detail upon Count Corti's book, and yet not more fully than its importance merits: and there remains a wealth of first-hand material for the historical student to digest. In view of the decisive influence exercised by Alexander III. upon the fate of Alexander of Battenberg, I cannot in conclusion resist quoting from a brilliant character-sketch of the former—much the most vivid and convincing that I have yet seen—contained in a report sent by General von Schweinitz to Prince Bismarck in January, 1886, and communicated by him to Count Kálnoky.

“He led a model family life, but looked on his position more from the private standpoint than from that of the state. Russian interests were to him predominantly personal interests, although he was a Russian patriot. He was a strong, firm character, open, honest and serious; lies and hypocrisy were repulsive to him, but he felt himself God's anointed and laid literal claim to boundless exercise of his will. He had the highest conception of the Tsardom and was jealous of maintaining his autocratic position. Good-humoured, peaceable and very fond of quiet, he would have been extremely happy to play at home with wife and children, in a narrow boyar circle, to eat simply but amply, to fish and shoot, and rule as patriarch over a peasant people, mild, economical, harsh to evildoers. His understanding was limited, he found it difficult to see through both men and things. Broad interests of state he could not grasp, his scanty education hampered him, and experience brought home to him a sense of these deficiencies. He often felt very keenly that others were superior to him in understanding and knowledge, and as he felt his position threatened by this, he was not only distrustful of those more intellectually gifted than himself, but also inwardly jealous and even hostile to them. Thus official intercourse with him was difficult, he let no one near him gladly, avoided so far as possible personal conversations, often cut them short by autocratic decisions, and liked best to work alone with documents and reports, without consulting the Ministers. He expected everything from God and the exalted nature of Tsardom—even to some extent to be made capable of conducting affairs—an expectation which partook of something mystical. Naturally he was often deceived, and no less naturally he was strongly influenced by those whom he trusted. As soon as he was aware of foreign influences and scented any personal

interest behind them, he lost confidence and drove the man roughly from him. Strong national feeling, mediocre culture, simplicity of thought, were his main qualities. European culture made him shy, because he did not quite understand it, yet felt its superiority. . . . Hence he was surrounded partly by clever *rusé* persons who assumed an air of simplicity, partly by extremely mediocre persons—simple country noblemen. The personal behaviour in the Emperor's house was such as would not have been tolerated in an European upper class house. Blunt and brutal as his habits was the Tsar's body: and it was known that his fist could compete with any athlete's.

"The more complicated the Government's political situation was, the more easily did Alexander III. succumb to the deception and influence of passionate and wily persons. He was soon surrounded by a web of lies and deliberate intrigue, in a small circle of persons who followed distinct and dangerous aims. Where his personal distrust was not awakened, he was of childlike credulity and trust. This circle (among them women) knew how to fill him with ideas which turned universally known facts quite topsy-turvy: and it was hard to destroy such ideas, because by renouncing them he felt hurt in his dignity, and his strong self-consciousness resisted confessing bad mistakes either to himself or to others. He was far rather inclined, in the face of commonsense reasons, to rely on the divine inspiration of Tsardom. Thus it came about that he remained in very great uncertainty as to conditions inside and outside Russia, and that his actions were decided partly by lack of judgment and partly by superstition. He was convinced that the Nihilists were godless, the Russian people rich and contented; that in Russia there was full religious tolerance and every minor could adopt the faith he thought best. In home administration he always wished to be just, but was harsh and brutal against what seemed to him resistance or wrong. Towards high dignitaries he was very reserved. He was in continual fear of assassination, and hence very suspicious and nervously irritated by any unusual occurrence. An unusual noise might lead him to use his bodily strength against the first person he met.

"On the whole he was honorable, virtuous, slow (*schwerfällig*), without passion, of limited intelligence, intended for a quiet and easy-going life. For a statesman he lacked the necessary love of work, ambition and good judgment, no less than the love of ruling and acute perception. One who knew how to keep his knowledge in the background, to take religion and autocracy as his foundation, to be simple, to suggest thoughts to him indirectly in the course of discussion, and not to betray superiority or arouse jealousy, such a man could win influence and be acceptable to the Tsar. A straightforward person only too soon fell out with this character, in itself so straight and open." As Count Corti aptly points out, this last trait explains the conflict between the Tsar and Prince Alexander.

R. W. SETON-WATSON.

RECENT RUSSIAN ANTHOLOGIES.

MANY causes combine towards making the anthology a particularly welcome type of book to the Russian reader, especially to the Russian refugee. The Russian refugee has, as a rule, left the books he had in Russia; his buying capacity is small; so a book like an anthology, which will do the service of many books, is a godsend. Besides for many years the taste for poetry has been ripening and mellowing among the educated classes of Russia, and the anthology meets this need. Quite a quantity of anthologies have appeared within the last two or three years, for the most part outside Soviet Russia. The most ambitious of these anthologies is the *Russky Parnas* (Russian Parnassus) compiled by Alexander and David Eliasberg (Insel-Verlag, Leipzig, 1920), forming part of the series *Bibliotheca Mundi*. The book, like all the publications of the Insel-Verlag, is well brought out and has an elegant appearance. It is only to be regretted that the type is antiquated, and disagreeably reminiscent of the German editions of "forbidden" Russian books that used to appear in the Sixties and Seventies. The compilers are Russian Germans. The selections cover the whole of the field of Russian literary poetry from Lomonosov to 1917. The editors have an extensive first-hand knowledge of Russian poetry, and the poets to be represented have been chosen fairly well. No really important names are omitted, but when it comes to the *dî minores* of the Russian Parnassus some objections suggest themselves. The poetic work of Karamzin and of Turgenev is not represented, nor is Radishchev, whose "Sapphics" are certainly one of the most charming of XVIIIth century lyrics. Gnedich, also, and Benediktov are missed, whereas Teplyakov could easily have been dispensed with. Among the moderns it is gratifying to see Annensky receiving ample notice, but surely Anna Akhmatova might have received more than a single page, and we regret the absence of Marina Tsvetayeva. The selections of individual poems are far less commendable. Some of them are well nigh grotesque: for instance, Ryleyev, the tragical and lofty poet of Dekabrism, is represented by a piece of buffoonery and an insipid historical ballad. The selections from Derzhavin do not include either "God" or "The Death of Meshchersky," which is like making an English anthology without "St. Cecilia's Feast." And in other cases the editors seem to have deliberately refrained from including the poets' best work, merely because it has been accepted as such (*e.g.*, Polonsky, Fet, Maykov, Nekrasov, A. Tolstoy). The "discoveries" of the editors are generally far from felicitous. They would have done better to follow the beaten track and accept the *δὲς τε πρὶς τε καλὰ*. Among the moderns, where the editor is more at large, the selections are still less felicitous:—for instance, several pages are devoted to selections from Bryusov's later books (1910–1918), a dreary desert of uninspired mechanical versification. On the whole, however, *The Russian Parnassus* has to be

welcomed as the only, if far from adequate, anthology covering the whole field of Russian literary poetry, and, with the aforesaid limitations, may be recommended to the reader.

Of the other anthologies, the greater part limit themselves to modern poetry, or pursue special ends. Such, for instance, is *Raduga* (the Rainbow) edited by Sasha Cherny (Berlin, 1921. "Slovo" Press), a book of verse for children. It includes poetry of different ages, and much of the poetry included is good, but much is also included that is indifferent or bad. The whole book is vitiated by its childishness, a thing intolerable to children when once past ten. Nearly all the pieces included are more or less sentimental and sloppy, and there is nothing of what one could call poetry for boys. Lermontov's *Borodino* would have been a rather obvious thing to have included, and Gumilev might have lent himself to excellent selections.

Of the anthologies devoted exclusively to modern poetry, the first in date is that of Melnikova Papushkova's *Antologia Russkoy Poezii XX. Veka* (Anthology of Russian Poetry of the XXth Century), Prague, 1920, in two exceedingly slovenly, unbound volumes. It is certainly a curiosity. The editor's prefaces to each of the two volumes are masterpieces of stupidity, ignorance and bad Russian. The selections are quite at random and nearly exclusively from the earlier work of the poets (before 1910). The Anthology is utterly worthless, except as a means of amusement to those perverse people who will enjoy the prefaces.

The little anthologies published by the *Mysl* Press of Berlin (in the series *Kniga Dlya Vsekh* (Everyman's Book), Nos. 1, 17 and 50-51) are frankly commercial. Still they are welcome as providing the reader with much excellent verse that as a rule is now inaccessible in any other form. The selections include Balmont, Bryusov, Blok, Sologub (No. 1), Z. Hippus, Lokhvitskaya, Goredtsky (No. 17), Annensky (an excellent selection), Voloshin, V. Ivanov, Gumilev, Anna Akhmatova (Nos. 50-51). As they are very cheap (6d. in England), they have had a considerable success.

A more ambitious and more interesting anthology is *Portrety Russkikh Poetov* (Portraits of Russian Poets) by Ilya Ehrenburg, himself a poet and prose-writer of no mean achievement (*Argonavty* Press. Berlin, 1922). It includes short notices of each of the poets and selections. Each poet is represented by five poems. The poets represented are Akhmatova, Baltrushitis, Balmont, Blok, Bryusov, Bely, Voloshin, Esenin, Ivanov, Mandelstamm, Mayakovsky, Pasternak, Sologub, and Tsvetayeva. We regret the omission of Gumilev, Kuzmin, Khodosevich and Klyuev. The notices are very subjective and "impressionist," but contain many interesting appreciations and, based as they are on personal acquaintance, much valuable information. The selections are also to a degree subjective, but Mr. Ehrenburg's taste is interesting in itself, and he certainly has in most cases given true "portraits," having succeeded in singling out

particularly characteristic pieces. We think he exaggerates the importance of Pasternak, whom he seems to think the most promising of the younger generation. But he is also the first anthologist to give due attention to the exquisitely fresh and spontaneous poetry of Marina Tsvetayeva.

A place apart is occupied by anthologies devoted to Russian poetry since 1917. Of these there are two published by the *Mysl* Press, Berlin (in the series *Kniga Dlya Vsekh*, Nos. 2-3 and 57-58). The first is a haphazard and quite fortuitous collection of what the publishers could lay hands on at the end of 1920. Much of it is worthless. But it has a certain importance as being the cheapest accessible book containing Blok's *The Twelve*. It also contains interesting specimens of Esenin and Ehrenburg. The second is far more valuable; it was edited by Ehrenburg, who brought from Moscow in the autumn of 1921 a treasure-house of recent poetry, much of it unpublished, nearly all difficult of access. The collection is not wholly representative. Petrograd and the Provinces are admittedly under-represented. But it contains many masterpieces and gives a striking picture of the extraordinary vitality, courage and energy which Russian poetry has shown in the most adverse circumstances. The jewel of the collection is Vyacheslav Ivanov's sublime sequence of twelve *Winter Sonnets*, one of the purest and highest manifestations of the Russian poetical genius in recent times. Another gem is Gumilev's *Stray Tramcar*, and the short epigrammatic piece of Akhmatova. Among the younger poets Anna Radlova, Maria Shkapskaya and Vasily Kazm are particularly interesting.

All these anthologies have been published outside Russia. In Soviet Russia, where such a quantity of first rate poetry is being all the time published, there is, it would seem, less demand for anthologies, and the few that appear have all special subjects. We have not as yet been able to procure Yury Verkhovsky's *Poety Pushkinoy pory* (Poets contemporary to Pushkin). The name of the editor would seem to guarantee the excellency of the book.

A charming little volume is *Tsarskoe Selo v Russkoy Poezii* (Tsarskoe Selo in Russian Poetry) by E. Gollerbach (*Parthenon* Press, Petrograd, 1922). It is remarkable how much first-rate poetry has been inspired by that little town. Among the selections are some of the masterpieces of Pushkin and Tyutchev. Annensky, who spent all his life at Tsarskoe and was headmaster of the local gymnasium, naturally figures prominently. And it is agreeable to find adequately represented Count V. Komarovsky, whose best years were also spent at Tsarskoe, and whose peculiar and very personal charm has not up to the present received universal recognition.

D. SVYATOPOLK-MIRSKY.

The Jail: Experiences in 1916. By J. S. Machar. Authorised translation from the Czech by P. Selver. Oxford (Basil Blackwell). 1921. 8vo. 219 pp.

THE author of this interesting book is one of the most popular Czech poets. He gained his popularity not only by his early collections of lyric poems, in which he analysed his own moods and his unfavourable social position, or by his later *Confessions of a Man of Letters*, in which he drew with relentless candour a picture of his gloomy youth, but, above all, by his eminent critical faculty, which he applied to himself as well as to others.

In one of his earlier poems he declared Jan Neruda to be his master. And there really is a certain spiritual kinship and similarity between him and the founder of modern Czech literature—notably the fact that each in his own time and in his own way became what we might call the conscience of their nation. In his later works Machar employed his acute criticism more for other purposes than the morbid scrutinising of his own mind and heart. In his poems, satires, epigrams, and above all in his prose works he criticised his nation, its politics at home and in Vienna, its public affairs, its writers and literature. Afterwards he applied his pungent critical ability to Austria and Rome, and, widening his horizon as well as his interest, to historical events and typical personages from old China and ancient Greece to the French Revolution and Napoleon I. Although future generations will possibly prefer his “lyrical dramas” *Here Should Roses Blossom*, his modern epic *Magdalen*, and his intimate lyrics to his *Conscience of the Ages* (as he calls the long cycle of lyric and short epic poems in which he surveys the development of mankind), they will certainly return again and again to his books of prose, in which he held up the mirror to his contemporaries and stood as their public conscience.

One of these books will be the *Jail*, written during the last two years of the war and published now in an excellent English translation by Mr. Selver. It contains Machar’s memoirs of his imprisonment in Vienna in 1916, but it is so vivid, so impressive that it reads like a successful novel of a dramatic character. It may be called (*cum grano salis*) a political book, as everything in Austria of that time turned into politics or was connected with politics in some way or other; but the most human feelings pervade it from the first to the last page. We hear of the war on the Russian and Italian fronts, of court-martial proceedings, of the arrest and imprisonment of Czech deputies and politicians, of persecutions, cruelties and crushed lives, but all this is only a dark background. Before it we see a filthy room with barred windows near the ceiling, cold as a cellar even on hot summer days, crammed with bags, boxes, sacks of straw and bundles, full of smoke and stench and crowded with human beings—sitting, standing, walking about as in a dirty third class waiting-room of some provincial railway station.” Some are impatient, some bored, some resigned, but the train is late and nobody knows how many hours, or days, or weeks, or

months it may take before the porter opens the door to let them out. Only a room, but a whole world in itself, with its own laws and morality. Rascals of many shades, thieves, impostors and murderers are breathing the same damp air with political "criminals" and innocent people who do not know why they are here and why they have not yet been released or brought up for trial. Nearly every day a newcomer appears, tells his story and disappears again, or is added to the "stock" of No. 60. Their life is monotonous, their days are dull and drab as the walls around, but the weeks and months seem to be very short because of the little, meaningless incidents which quickly pass away and are easily forgotten.

The only man who does not forget them is the poet. At night he often dreams of meadows in a glowing June; or of boats floating across the sea. In the morning he walks listlessly from the "Street of the Blind" to the "Street of the Tigers," a warder in front, a warder behind, or looks eagerly at a patch of blue sky through the barred window; in the evening he listens to the warbling of a skylark which somehow or other has found its way from the fields to within reach of the jail as if it knew the whereabouts of this lover of freedom. But otherwise he takes note of everything in the room and many things outside, of every individual and his doings, he reads into their hearts and characters, and shares in their interests, arranging entertainments in order to drive away their melancholy and revive their flickering hopes. Although he himself suffers in mind and body, he never loses his temper. He feels the injustice which brought him there very keenly, but he rejects the vain glory of a martyr: for to him the romanticism of "martyrdom" is a thing of the past. "Honour is due only to those who went forth into the dark and staked everything upon their labours," he says at the end of his book, thinking of his friend Masaryk and those who helped Masaryk abroad.

A very human book is this historical and literary document of the Austrian jail.
F. CHUDOBA.

Otakar Březina: A Study in Czech Literature. By P. Selver, 1921.
(Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 8vo. 61 pp.)

SOME critics consider Otakar Březina (born in 1868) to be the most powerful and original poet produced by the Czechs during the nineteenth century. He is at least the most philosophical, the richest in imagery and the most musical. When he wrote and published the five books of lyrics which so far form the whole of his poetical work, he was only a teacher at an elementary school in western Moravia. Later on he moved to another place and to a higher type of school, but he still lives in a little country town in southern Moravia. During the last two decades he has not published any new poems, and his essays, called *Music of the Springs*, which appeared nineteen years ago for the first time, were mostly written before the year 1900. He is too critical to print anything that would not add a new note to what he has already said. For a similar reason he suppressed all the verses and prose-

writings which he had published in periodicals before his first book, *Secret Distances* (1895). Thus his poetical works do not reveal the fact that he, too, went through a period of realism, and it may well seem to many readers of his poems as though "all contact with the world of reality has been eliminated" from them. It is true that in his *Secret Distances*, *Dawn in the West* (1896), *Polar Winds* (1897), *The Temple Builders* (1899), *The Hands* (1901), and *The Music of the Springs* (1903) he displays his mystical character. But this mysticism conceals a great many elements of reality and observation. He says in one of his poems that "our thoughts have bathed in the fiery waves of a sacred summer which kindles the azure of souls with the glow of all the Augusts and the ripening of all the stars; and when they had cleared away their painful tokens of earth, they rose up in the purity of the earliest lights." And in another poem he speaks of "eyes blinded by an over-great lustre" and of "the slain by time, as by the fragrance of unknown blossoms." But before he could coin these metaphors and through them shadow forth his deeper meanings, he had to observe real things and to study various sciences dealing with them. Before he arrived at his all-embracing cosmic philosophy; before he created his sublime conception of the cosmic brotherhood—of those myriads of hands which in a magical chain are outstretched towards their brethren across continents and silent realms of all the oceans—he had to go through acute private sufferings, as we may guess from his *Secret Distances*.

His eyes and other senses were, however, not satisfied with the surface of things; they penetrated beyond it and soon acquired the power of "second sight" which enabled him to speak of things unseen and unheard by common empirics or impressionists. This "second sight" makes him a mystic; and his unusual imagination enables him to express his visions in a language which has no parallel in the whole of Czech poetry and only very rarely finds its equal, even in the greatest European literatures.

But if we analyse him a little more deeply, we discover that, in spite of his mysticism and in spite of his vast knowledge of literature and philosophy—European and Asiatic alike—he, too, is rooted in the soil of his country. His profound interest in the social development and organisation of mankind, his genuine religious feeling, his belief in the spiritual brotherhood of all men, the living and the dead "who whisper in our thoughts and whose breath we feel like giddiness in places where no one stood before us"—in a word, his poetical philosophy—has much in common with the ideas of the greatest representatives of the Czech people from Peter Chelčický, the spiritual father of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren, down to T. G. Masaryk. He, too, is a representative man, one of the best whom the Czech people has produced.

Mr. Selver, who has published during the past few years translations from Březina in various English periodicals and in his two

Anthologies,¹ returns to the great poet once more in order to provide for English readers "an adequate survey of Březina's artistic achievement as a whole." He does not attempt an elaborate criticism of his poems and essays. His chief aim is to show how the poet looks in his own garments, modified, of course, by the process of translation from one language into another. He selects characteristic pieces from his lyrics and meditations, connecting them by his own explanations and critical remarks, in which he informs the reader, as briefly as possible, of Březina's artistic development, his images, his style, his poetical technique, his ideas, his philosophy. In the concluding paragraphs he emphasises the difficulties which an English translator has to face if he endeavours, not only to express the ideas, to preserve the rhythm, to reproduce the imagery, but also to convey the syntactic and musical effects which Březina attains in his native language whose peculiar genius is, as the author says quite rightly, an essential factor in his artistic creation. These difficulties are very considerable in a language such as English which, having dropped most of its vowel-endings, has dropped a great deal of its own music. They are traceable also in Mr. Selver's translations, as he feels himself. These cannot replace the original poems—indeed what translations can?—but, taken together with his critical remarks, they form a concise and useful English introduction to the poetry of Otakar Březina. F. CHUDOBA.

Macbeth, Merchant of Venice: a Midsummer Night's Dream. By Shakespeare, translated into Slovene by Oton Župančič. Preface and Notes by Dr. Jakob Kelemina. Frontispiece design by Vavpotič. Ljubljana (Tiskovna Zadruga), 1922. 15 dinars each.

A CONSIDERABLE number of Yugoslav poets, Serb, Croat, and Slovene, have at various times tried their hands at Shakespeare translations. Oton Župančič's Slovene translations, three volumes of which are at this moment before me, are the latest, perhaps the best, of all these Yugoslav translations so far, and certainly the most important from one notable point of view—they are made direct from the original text, without the intermediary of other translations, however good.

Now a Shakespeare translation, quite apart from the intrinsic qualifications of the translator, is one of the severest tests to which a language may be put. At the time when Shakespeare wrote, the English language was in the full riot of one of its periodic spring-tides of linguistic increase. Shakespeare's work represents this flood at its best and strongest. Even the most incorrigible son of modern times would scarcely care to deny that his vocabulary is richer than ours and quite as telling. The strength of English lies in the incongruous elements that have gone to its making, in the kaleidoscopic effects that can be compassed by their skilful use. And no one has known better than Shakespeare how to deal with the component parts of

¹ *Anthology of Modern Slavonic Literature* (1919) and *Modern Czech Poetry* (1920). London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.

our speech—after the fashion of a Japanese embroiderer combining the different “lines” of coloured silks in a picture remarkable alike for subtlety and breadth.

The charm of Slovene, on the other hand, lies in its homogeneity. It is something of a linguistic back-water among the Slav tongues, and spoken only by about one million and a half souls. Grammatical intricacies—common to all archaic tongues—take the place of wealth of vocabulary; its beauty is the beauty of homely tradition. On the other hand, it offers a wonderful range of sounds—in this respect, indeed, it is scarcely second to English itself. It is also rich in monosyllabic words and strong final accents. Župančič’s translation proves that in the hands of a skilful poet it is by no means a contemptible material out of which to fashion a garment even for Shakespeare’s thought, or an untuneful instrument upon which to render the music of his verse.

As a Slovene poet, Župančič possesses originality and charm. He has humour, sympathy, and a sense of the dramatic as well, all of which stand him in good stead in the colossal task he has undertaken—nothing less than to provide a complete translation, a *One Man’s Work*, of Shakespeare’s plays in Slovene. So far he has finished *Julius Cæsar* (out of print for some time, but now in its second edition), *Macbeth*, *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, *The Merchant of Venice*—all published. *The Comedy of Errors* and *Othello* exist in MS., and *Twelfth Night* is begun. The rest of the plays are to follow.

Let it be clearly understood at once that Župančič’s translation is first and foremost poetic and idiomatic. He makes ample use of all available commentaries and glossaries; but when in doubt relies on his own taste and instinct. He has made a careful study of Shakespeare’s verse, and has captured the rhythm of it; but his short lines do not always correspond, line for line, with Shakespeare’s. Some phrases come out longer, some shorter, than in the English text. But the right touch and comprehension are there—force and directness—essentials without which the most scholarly and painstaking translation is only a glorified gloss. Above all, there is virility in his work which lifts it out of the ruck of translations and places it among those which must be judged by standards at once more liberal and more severe than those applicable to ordinary “good” translations. There is far too much femininity about the best of them, as a rule. They follow and accompany instead of constructing an equivalent in the new material—something which will give to the new public a fresh possession comparable to that which the original author offered to his own people. To obtain a just view of Župančič’s translations, you have to take them as a whole, and, if possible, to *hear* them. He takes full advantage of the fact that unlike Serbo-Croat, Slovene is barely standardised as yet, and he deals with his mother tongue with authority, as only a poet may, in order to compel it to suffice for the tremendous new demand upon it.

As an example of his workmanship I quote the following lines from *Macbeth* (*Macb.* : If thou speak'st false, etc.) :—

Macbeth : Če se lažeš,
 na prvem boš drevesu visel živ
 da glad te izsuši ; če govoriš resnico,
 lahko takisto narediš za meno.
 Gotovost se mi maje ; in že sumim
 da je dvoumje v vragovih besedah,
 ki laže, kot govoril bi resnico :
 " Ne boj se, dokler birnamski ti les
 na Dunsinane ne pride " ;—in sedaj
 pomika les se proti Dunsinanu.
 Orožje dajte mi, orožje ! Ven !
 Če tega zatrdilo me ne laže
 ostati ne bežati mi ne kaže.
 Utrudil sem se solnca ; zdaj bi rad
 da zruši stavba se sveta v prepad.
 Bij, plat zvoná !—Rjuij veter ! Mori, srd !
 Z oklepom na hrptû me vrzi smrt !

This is quite straightforward as regards the rhythm. But there are passages where the style is reserved and the lines are frankly not of the same " pattern " as the English text. Let us say, it would be difficult to sing both to the same tune. Compare Župančič's *On the ground* from *Midsummer Night's Dream* with the original :

Spak :

Spite zdravo	ljubi jo kot prejšnje dni.
med travo :	In kot star pregovor pravi,
zdaj na veka	da naj svoje vsak pospravi
ná leka,	to se naj pri vas pojavi :
ki ozdravi to oči.	vsemi Janez Mico,
Ko jih odpreš	vsakemu pravico ;
in uzreš	svojo kapo vsak na glavo,
njo, ki si jo ljubil prej,	in vse zdravo !
se ji nasmej,	(<i>Spak odide.</i>)

It is a case of a Slovene equivalent ; lines in which the spirit has been transferred and something of the form sacrificed.

Of the three translations before me, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (*Sen kresne noči*) is the most successful all round. Župančič's own poetry has an elfin charm which adapts itself readily to the theme. Moreover, the play is rich in lyrics, and Župančič is most happy in his rhymed passages. The names of the clowns are metamorphosed into Slovene equivalents, and *Puck* becomes *Spak*, suggestive of the Scandinavian *Spøg*—a jest. In *Macbeth*, the gruesome chant of the witches comes out well, owing to the reason just given ; but Macbeth's lines in the last Act—always among my favourite passages in Shakespeare—are, in my opinion, among the best the Slovene has given us so far. In *The Merchant of Venice*, Shylock's style is scarcely sufficiently differ-

entiated from that of the other characters. It is not altogether the translator's fault. Shakespeare's character-drawing is very subtle and complete in detail, and he has given us an English-speaking Jew. But Slovenia is on a par with Aberdeenshire as regards Jews and Župančič lacked his model. By way of contrast, I am looking forward to his Antonio in *Twelfth Night*. To compensate for Shylock, Bassanio has lost none of his feckless charm, and it is not even necessary to understand Slovene to appreciate that Portia's most famous speech is beautiful also in its newest incarnation.

There are certainly "bits" here and there where the text could still be improved and probably will be revised in future editions, but they are trifles compared to the impression conveyed by the whole—and they do not affect the poetic merit of the translation, which is a valuable and beautiful addition to the vast bulk of Shakespeare bibliography. But to judge fully of the measure of Župančič's work, one must be a Slovene. To appreciate and criticise it even superficially, you must know not only Shakespeare, but Slovene—and season knowledge with a little love

F. S. COPELAND.

Serbo-Croatian Self-taught by Natural Methods. By J. J. R. O'Beirne, London (E. Marlborough & Co.), 1921. 8vo, pp. 112.

"THE volume contains carefully selected and comprehensive *vocabularies, conversational phrases and sentences*, such as are wanted daily by *tourists, travellers, business men, civil and military officers*, etc." These are Mr. O'Beirne's own words in the preface to this book, but we must add that the conversational phrases in particular, as they stand (from p. 72 to 107) cannot be of much use unless the innumerable mistakes are corrected in the next issue of the book. Let us quote some of them. No Serb would say (p. 72) *Ste li vrlo dobro* = Are you quite well; but *jeste li*, etc. The *interrogative* in Serbo-Croatian is formed by putting the interrogative particle "li" immediately after the *full* forms of the verb "biti," except in the third person sing. On p. 67 Mr. O'Beirne gives the present tense of the verb *biti* = to be, but he should know that the short forms "sam, si, je," etc., *must* be preceded by the personal pronoun; hence, I am = *ja sam* or *jesam*, etc.

The phrase *vrlo jesam vam zahvalan* (p. 72) should be "*vrlo sam vam zahvalan*"; *ste li vi zdravi* and *zdravi li ste* (p. 74) should be "*jeste li zdravi*"; *ja se nadam da ce budimo opet sastali* (p. 74) should be "*nadam se da ćemo se opet sastati*"; *kako dugo ste se vi učili* (p. 76) should be "*koliko ima vremena kako učite*," or "*otkada učite*"; *ja ne mislim puno toga* (p. 78) should be "*ja nemam bogzna kakvo mišljenje o tome*"; *moja krivina* (p. 79) should be "*moja krivica*"; *da li vi me ne čujete* (p. 79) should be "*zar me ne čujete*"; *je li ste odali moje stvari* (p. 80) should be "*jeste li predali moje stvari*"; *idete li vi sa brzom vozom* (p. 81) should be "*idete li brzim vozom*"; *ja se želim istupiti* (p. 82) should be "*želim da se skinem (or izigjem)*"; *molim vas vruća voda* (p. 83) should be "*moljim vas vruće vode*";

ste li obukali (p. 84) should be "jeste li se obukli"; *odmah cu biti obukao* (p. 84) should be "odmah ću biti gotov," etc., etc. All these are utterly wrong and utterly un-Serb and indeed could not be found even in the most depraved dialect.

There are many more such errors, several on practically every page. Even if we allow that many are due to misprints, it is difficult to find any explanation, save insufficient knowledge of the language, for such blunders as the following: *možem ja videti gospodinu* (p. 93); *gde je naša prostor* (p. 97); *putnici se obziraju da držaju štenge prosto* (p. 99), cannot be excused at all. The correct phrases in each case would be:

"mogu li videti gospodina"; "gde su naša mesta"; "umoljavaju se putnici da ne stoje u hodniku (or na putu, prolazu)."

There are also incorrect statements such as that "the Serbian Government has abolished the teaching of the Cyrillic alphabet in the schools and substituted the Roman" (p. 3), or that Serbo-Croatian "contains no sounds which are not found in English" (p. 7). In the "outline of grammar" (p. 56), Mr. O'Beirne gives rules about the genders, but does not indicate a great many exceptions which cannot be ignored. The statement about definite and indefinite adjectives (p. 60) is incorrect.

D. P. SUBOTIĆ.

Nauka o stikhe. Chast I.: Chastnaya Metrika i Ritmika russkago yazika. (The Science of Verse. Metrics and Rhythmics.) Valery Bryusov. Moscow ("Altsiona" Press). 1919.

THIS book is the outcome of the course of lectures delivered by Bryusov in the Studio of Versification ("Studio Stikhovedenia") in Moscow in the spring of 1918. It is a textbook destined to serve as an aid to the teacher and lecturer, and it is too bald and concise to be readable. In fact, a reader who is not well at home in Russian and Classical prosody will not be able to read it without the greatest effort. It is the first part of a system of Russian prosody and is devoted to the study of the "line" as apart from any sequence of verse. Being the first, and the only really serious, exposition of the subject (since the very antiquated, though still rather valuable book of Vostokov, in 1820), and written as it is by one of our most eminent experts in the craft of verse, the book is of course of great interest. Bryusov's theory of Russian prosody is based on a system of feet, and is practically identical with Prof. Saintsbury's theory of English prosody. Unhappily it has not the exquisite literary qualities which Prof. Saintsbury has been able to impress even on his textbook of prosody. Apart from excessive baldness and dogmatism, the principal fault of the book is a lack of purely linguistic teaching. Thus Bryusov seems not aware of the difference between the orthographic and the pronounced word, and regards all monosyllables as equally heavily stressed. Consequently he finds spondees in lines where no ear would detect anything but an iambic. But the theory of feet and of substitution (to use Prof. Saintsbury's term) is developed with ability and thoroughness. All who are interested in Russian verse and in

its structure should read this book, and those who are capable of thinking for themselves will certainly profit greatly by it. D. S. M.

Valery Bryusov i Nasledie Pushkina. (Bryusov and the Legacy of Pushkin.) V. Zhirmunsky. Petrograd ("Elzevir"), 1922.

MR. ZHIRMUNSKY is one of the most prominent students of the theory of literature or, as it is called in Russia, of "Poetics" (Poetika). He is on the whole a follower of Veselovsky, but tries to give his studies a broader theoretical basis, not limiting himself to mere historical investigation. The main outlines of his method are expounded in an excellent article on the *Task of Poetics* in the first number of the *Nachala*, already reviewed, *vide infra*. It consists in studying the poetical *procédé* (*priem*) without ever losing sight of its position in poetical work as a whole. This he calls the "teleological" method in poetics. Thus not merely the use of this or that *procédé* but the use the poet makes of it in the general constructive plan of his work, is important and characteristic of his style and of the style of an epoch or a school. One of the most firmly grounded results in Mr. Zhirmunsky's study of Pushkin is that Pushkin's style is closely allied to the classical style of the XVIIIth century, and that, on the other hand, the later poets of the XIXth century did not follow Pushkin in their style, but continued the romantic tradition which Zhukovsky had imported from England and Germany. The chief characteristics of Pushkin's style are his sparseness and lack of originality in the use of metaphor, his absolute reliance on tropes of metonymic type, and his absolute command over "the logical element of speech." All this had been more or less guessed at by all those who have studied Pushkin, but Mr. Zhirmunsky gives it the conclusiveness of scientific fact. This is what we find in the *Task of Poetics*. In the book on Bryusov Mr. Zhirmunsky sets out to destroy the deeply-rooted superstition that would make Bryusov the modern preserver of the Pushkin tradition. He succeeds in destroying it very thoroughly. He analyses the continuation of Pushkin's *Cleopatra*, by Bryusov, where the modern poet makes the greatest effort to be like his model. But the essence of Bryusov's style is diametrically opposed to that of Pushkin's. His principal weapon is metaphor, his use of *metonymy* is feeble and unintelligent. His command over the logical element of speech is small, and his poetic effects are invariably based on musical *procédés*. His epithets are vaguely emotional, where Pushkin's are visually exact. He is on the whole a continuator of the Romantic tradition, a comrade in arms of the new Romanticism. Mr. Zhirmunsky's book is a good example of clear-headed and disciplined method in the study of poetry.

D. S. M.

Nachala: Zhurnal istorii literatury i istorii obshchestvennosti. (First Principles: A Review of Literary and Social History.) Edited by the Academicians S. Oldenburg and S. Platonov, Prof. E. L. Radlov and A. S. Nikolayev. No. 1. Petrograd 1921.

THIS is a product of the short-lived revival of the publishing trade

which Soviet Russia witnessed in the second half of 1921 and beginning of 1922. The second number of the Review does not seem to have appeared. It is extraordinarily interesting as demonstrating to what an extent the academic and literary circles of Petrograd have kept alive their interest for knowledge and literature in spite of all their sufferings and adversities. The book is divided into four parts. The first is devoted to original essays. It includes an article by S. Oldenburg on Alexander Blok; an essay by Nestor Kotlyarevsky on Dostoyevsky; an extraordinarily interesting and profound essay by Prof. Karsavin on Fedor Karamazov "as an ideologist of love;" an article by V. Zhirmunsky on poetics (which we have reviewed above); and two other articles on the theory of literature, one on Gogol and the other on Maupassant.

The second section includes unpublished materials, among which the most interesting are the autobiography of Countess Leo Tolstoy, a letter by Gogol, a letter of V. Solovyev to Nicholas II. on the position of the Russian Church, and a series of deliciously quaint XVIIth century love letters, written in 1686 by a provincial clerk to his sweetheart, and made public in a law suit.

The third section is devoted to reviews of books, among which the most interesting are those by Mr. Zhirmunsky on three new studies of the theory of literature, Mr. Jacobson's pamphlet on the futurist poet Khlebnikov, and Viktor Shklovsky's books on Rozanov and on Sterne's *Tristram Shandy* and *The Theory of the Novel*. These show how very much work is being done in this direction by quite a galaxy of young Russian scholars.

The fourth section is devoted to the current literature of the West. It is not so much out of date as might have been supposed. Among English books noticed are *The Salvaging of Civilisation* by Wells, and the new edition of Robert Bridges' *Prosody of Milton*. D. S. M.

Von Belgrad bis Buccari: eine unphilosophische Reise. By Hermann Wendel. Frankfurt (Frankfurter Societäts-Druckerei), 1922. 8vo. 144 pp. (Illust.)

THE last eight years have produced a large crop of volumes devoted to the experiences of British voluntary workers with the Serbian army. Several of them have considerable literary merit, but all are absorbed by the events of the Great War, and contribute surprisingly little to our knowledge of the people or the country for whom their authors worked. It is, therefore, by no means superfluous to draw the English reader's attention to this German book of travel pictures from Jugoslavia. Moreover, Herr Wendel not merely has an intimate first hand knowledge of Yugoslav history, politics and literature, but has the honourable distinction of having raised his voice loudly in favour of Yugoslav unity and against the fatal Balkan policy of the Central Powers both before and during the Great War.

This little volume, which is doubtless modelled upon Hermann Bahr's wellnigh classic *Dalmatinische Reise*, is avowedly a mere record of passing impressions : in its author's own words, it is "*im Grunde kein Baedeker, sondern ein Bekenntnis*. But it is eminently readable, its style has a vivacity not too often found in German; and in passing it scatters much new information concerning such various matters as the famous prophecies of Mateja, the brigands of the Sandjak, the young Moslem writers of Bosnia and their campaign against the veil. There are effective descriptions of Užice, once called the Serbian Mecca; of Sarajevo, which he christens "the Orient at its setting" (*der Untergang des Orients*); of wonderful Dubrovnik (Ragusa) with its long republican tradition; of Lovćen, "the bastion of Serbian freedom"; of the poverty-stricken land of the Black Mountain. And here we may stop to note his plain hint to those "well intentioned persons in London and less well-intentioned persons in Rome" who talk of a Montenegrin "nationality." "We shall be hearing next of a Waldeckian, a Reussian a Schwarzburg-Sondershausian nationality. For the Montenegrins are Serbs of the purest blood and are proud of the fact." To understand the so-called "Montenegrin question," it is only necessary to visit the country with open eyes. "For nine out of every ten Montenegrins, agriculture and cattle-breeding are the means of sustenance. Of these nine, six have no land or only tiny inadequate scraps, and must hire themselves out. But in all Montenegro—even in the fertile lands around the lake of Skutari—there are not ten properties which offer employment all the year round for ten workmen each Give them work and bread, build roads, bridges, railways! Settle them in the Metohija or on Kosovo, where ample land awaits rake and spade, and the Montenegrin question dies away." On the late King's tyranny he is justly severe :—"His subjects he plundered to the shirt and sold himself and his country and its future; he took, wherever he could get, from France, from Russia, from Austria, from the Sultan, from Bulgaria. . . . and through him the moral standards of a whole generation were undermined" (p. 112).

To those readers whose appetite these travel sketches may whet, I can most cordially recommend Herr Wendel's earlier volume *Aus dem südslawischen Risorgimento* (Gotha (Perthes), 1921). Neither in Serbo-Croat nor in any other language can we find such an admirable and balanced a survey of the very different strains which have contributed to the achievement of Yugoslav unity.

R. W. S. W.

We note with great satisfaction that our French colleagues of the sister Institut d'Études Slaves in Paris, are about to publish a Polish Grammar by M. Meillet and Mme. de Willmann-Grabowska (now in the press); a Czech Grammar, by M. André Mazon; and a Serbo-Croat Grammar by M. Meillet.

We commend very strongly to our readers' attention their chief publication, *Revue des Études Slaves*, founded by the late Professor Ernest Denis, and edited by M. A. Meillet, Professor at the Collège de

France, and M. Paul Boyer, Director of the Paris School of Oriental Languages. It appears ten times a year (43 francs for abroad)—published by Ed. Champion, 5, Quai Malaquais, Paris VI^e. During 1921 it published, among other studies, articles by A. Meillet on "Slav Unity"; on Czechoslovak ethnography by J. Horák; on early Bulgarian linguistic problems by P. Cancel and S. Mladenov; on the Slavs in the Baltic by J. J. Mikkola; on French Art in Poland by Louis Réau; on Professor Denis by Louis Eisenmann and on the work of Shakhmatov by S. M. Kulbakin.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES.

Selection of Books on Czechoslovak Ethnography, History, and Literature, published during the last three or four years.

By F. Chudoba.

Národopis lidu československého. (Ethnography of the Czechoslovak People.) Part I. Moravské Slovensko. (Moravian Slovakia.) Vols. I.—II. Napsali: J. Húsek, J. Folprecht, J. Klvaňa, F. Kretz, L. Niederle, F. A. Slavík, J. Černík. Prague (Národopisné museum československé), 1918 & 1921. Large 4to, 664 pp., with numerous illustrations, plans, maps, etc.

Niederle, Lubor: Slovanské starožitnosti. Život starých Slovanů. Základy kulturních starožitností slovanských. (Slav Antiquities: Life of the Ancient Slavs: Foundations of Slavonic Cultural Antiquities.) Part III., vol. 1. Prague (Bursík & Kohout), 1921. Large 8vo. 346 p. (This volume is the eighth of the whole work of the „Slovanské starožitnosti.“)

Tille, Václav: Verzeichnis der böhmischen Märchen. Übersetzt aus dem Böhmischen. Part I., No. 1–8. (= F. F. Communications, edited for the Folklore Fellows by Joh. Bolte, Oskar Hackman, K. Krohn, C. W. von Sydow, vol. VI., No. 34). Helsinki (Finnish Academy of Sciences), 1921. 371 pp.

Hus, Jan: M. Jana Husi korespondence a dokumenty. Vydal Václav Novotný. Prague (Komise pro vydávání pramenů českého hnutí náboženského, 1920). (Works of John Huss, vol. 9.) 8vo, 381 + 56 pp.

Kapras, Jan: Právní dějiny zemí koruny české. (Legal History of the Lands of the Bohemian Crown.) Part III. Dějiny státního zřízení (History of State Institutions). Vol. 2: Doba pobělohorská (Period after the White Mountain), part 1. Prague (Česká grafická unie), 1920. 8vo. 232 pp. (2 maps).

Krofta, Kamil: Přehled dějin selského stavu v Čechách a na Moravě. (Historical Survey of the Peasantry in Bohemia and Moravia.) Prague (Published by the author), 1919. 8vo. 262 pp.

Masaryk, T. G. L'Europe Nouvelle. Paris (Imprimerie slave), 1918. 8vo. 228 + xxiii pp. [The English edition, under the title "The New Europe (The Slav Standpoint)," was printed in London, 1918, for private circulation only.]

Masaryk osvoboditel. (Masaryk the Liberator.) Sborník. Red., Karel Velemínský. Prague (Ministerstvo školství a národní osvěty), 1920. 8vo. 416 pp. (Contains, besides a poem by Hviezdoslav, six essays by various authors and a selection from Masaryk's opinions on religion, social problems, politics, the "Czech question," and so on.)

Masarykovy projevy a řeči za války. (Masaryk's War Utterances and Speeches.) Vydal a úvodem opatřil Prokop Maxa. I. Prague (St. Minařík), 1919. 8vo.

Doležal, Jaromír : Masarykova cesta životem. (Life of Masaryk.) I.-II. Brno (Polygrafie), 1920-21. 8vo. 120 + 236 pp.

Novotný, Václav : M. Jan Hus. Život a učení. (Life and Teachings of Hus.) Part I. Život a dílo. Vols. 1-2. Prague (Jan Laichter), 1919-1921. 8vo. 507 + 552 pp.

Pekař, Josef : Dějiny československé. (Czechoslovak History.) Prague (Historický Klub), 1921. 4to. 200 pp.

Pekař, Josef : Bílá Hora. Její příčiny i následky. (The White Mountain: its Causes and Effects.) Prague (Vesmír), 1921. 8vo. 163 pp.

Pekař, Josef : Z české fronty. (On the Czech Front.) I.-II. Prague (Český čtenář), 1919. 8vo. 200 pp.

Reformační Sborník. Práce z dějin československého života náboženského. (Essays on the History of Czechoslovak Religious Life.) Vydávají F. Bednář, F. Hrejsa, B. Souček. I. Prague (Nákladem Comenia), 1921. 8vo. 316 pp.

Steidler, F. V. : Československé hnutí na Rusi. (The Czechoslovaks in Russia.) Prague (Památník odboje), 1921. 8vo. 113 pp.

Šimák, J. V. : Kronika československá. I. Doba stará. Od časů nejstarších do reformace. (From the Earliest Times to the Reformation.) Vol. 1. Prague (Vesmír), 1921. 4to. 237 pp.

Šusta, Josef : Dvě knihy českých dějin. Kus středověké historie našeho kraje. (Two Books of Bohemian History: An attempt at the medieval history of our country.) Kniha první: Poslední Přemyslovci a jejich dědictví, 1300-1308. (The Last of the Přemysls and their Inheritance.) 8vo. 530 pp.—Kniha druhá: Počátky lucemburské. (The Beginnings of the Luxemburgs.) 1308-1320. Prague (Česká Akademie věd a umění), 1917-19. 323 pp.

Urbánek, R. : Věk poděbradský. (The Era of George Podebrad.) Part II. Prague (Jan Laichter), 1918. 8vo. 1047 pp.

Werstadt, Jaroslav : Politické dějepisectví devatenáctého století a jeho čeští představitelé. (The Political Historiography of the XIXth Century and its Czech representatives.) Prague, 1920. 8vo. 98 pp.

Bujnák, Pavol : Pavol Országh-Hviezdoslav. K 70tym jeho narodeninám. (On his 70th Birthday.) Lipt. Sv. Mikuláš (Tranoscius), 1919. 8vo. 176 pp.

Čapek, Thomas and Vostrovský-Čapek, Anna : Bohemian (Čech) Bibliography. A finding list [*sic*—Ed.] of writings in English, relating to Bohemia and the Čechs. New York (Fleming H. Revell), 1918. 8vo. 256 pp.

Frič, Jan : Život a dílo Aloisa Jiráska. (Life and Works of Jirásek.) K 70. výročí narozenin. Prague (Gustav Voleský), 1921. 8vo. 336 pp.

Frýdecký, F. : Slovensko literární od doby Bernolákovy. (Literary Slovakia since the Time of Bernolák.) Moravská Ostrava (Perout), 1920. 8vo. 309 pp.

Hodža, Milan : Československý rozkol. Príspevky k dejinám slovenčiny. (The Czechoslovak Schism : Contributions to the History of the Slovak Language.) Turčianský Sv. Martin (Nakladom, vlastným), 1920. 8vo. 400 pp.

O. Hostinského : Esthetika. Podle původních pramenů napsal Zdeněk Nejedlý. Part I. Prague (Jan Laichter), 1921. 8vo. lii + 458 pp.

Alois Jirásek. Sborník studií a vzpomínek na počest jeho sedmdesátých narozenin. (Collected Essays in honour of his 70th Birthday.) Pořádali Miloslav Hýsek část textovou, Karel B. Mádl část obrazovou. Prague (Jan Otto), 1921. 4to. 510 pp.

Kerner, Robert Joseph : Slavic Europe. A Selected Bibliography in the Western European Languages, comprising History, Languages and Literature. Cambridge (Harvard University Press), 1918. 8vo. xxiv. + 402 pp.

Kraus, Arnošt : Husitství v literatuře, zejména německé. (Hussitism in Literature, in particular German Literature.) I.–II. Prague (Česká Akademie pro vědy, slovesnost a umění), 1917–18. 8vo. 271 + 239 pp.

Krčméry, Štefan : Prehľad dejín slovenskej literatury a vzdelanosti. (Historical Survey of Slovak Literature and Culture.) Turč. Sv. Martin, 1920. 8vo. 125 pp.

Lelek, Josef : Božena Němcová. Babička, rodiče a sourozenci. Z pobytu na Domažlicku. Dora a Manka. Jaroslav a matka. (Studies in the Life of Božena Němcová.) Prague (Jos. Rašín a spol.), 1920. 8vo. 263 pp.

Novák, Arne : Svatopluk Čech. Dílo a osobnost. (Writings and Personality of S. Čech.) Part I. Prague (Vesmír,) 1921. 4to. xv + 238 pp.

Novák, Arne : České písemnictví s ptačí perspektivy. (Bird's-eye View of Czech Literature.) Prague (Aventinum), 1920. 8vo. 53 pp.

[The same in Esperanto : Čeĥa literaturo laŭ la birdperspektivo. Tradukis Vinc. Kroužil. Brno (Barvič a Novotný), 1921. 8vo. 58 pp.]

Novák, Arne : Studie o Janu Nerudovi. (Essays on Neruda.) Prague (F. Topič) 1919. 8vo. 134 pp.

Novák, Jan V. : Jan Amos Komenský. Jeho život a spisy. (Komenský's Life and Writings.) Prague (Dědictví Komenského), 1920. (Published in parts, not yet finished.)

Procházka, Arnošt : Díř literární a umělecký. Články a kritiky o literatuře, výtvarnictví a divadle. (Articles and Criticisms on Literature, Art and the Theatre.) Prague (L. Bradáč), 1919. 8vo. 428 pp.

Sborník prací věnovaných prof. Dr. Jiřímu Polívkovi k šedesátým narozeninám Společnosti národopisného musea československého. (Collected Essays dedicated to Prof. Polívka by the Society of the Czechoslovak Ethnographic Museum on his 60th anniversary.) Uspořádal Jiří Horák. Prague (Společnost nár. musea českoslov.), 1918. 8vo. 258 pp.

Strejček, Ferdinand : České školy básnické 19. věku. (Czech Schools of Poetry in the XIX. Century.) Prague (F. Topič), 1921. 8vo. 132 pp.

Škultéty, Jozef : Sto dvadsat'päť rokov zo slovenského života. 1790-1914. Odpoved' na knihu dr. Milana Hodžu, nazvanú „Československý rozkol.“ (120 Years of Slovak Life : Reply to Dr. Hodža's Book entitled "The Czechoslovak Schism.") Turčianský Sv. Martin (Nákladem spisovateľovým), 1920. 8vo. 148 pp.

Šrobár, Vavro : Boj o nový život. Výber programových, poučných i polemických článkov, úvah a literárnych kritik. (The Struggle for New Life : selection of programmatical, informative and polemical articles, reviews and literary criticisms). Ružomberk, 1920. 8vo. 497 pp.

Vlček, Jaroslav : Dějiny české literatury. (History of Czech Literature.) Dílu I. část 2 : Od věku zlatého k století osmnáctému, (From the Golden Age to the XVIII. Century.) Oddíl 1. Prague (Jednota českých filologů), 1921. 8vo. 124 pp.

Vychodil, Pavel : Život Václava Kosmáka. (Life of Kosmák.) Brno (Občanská tiskárna), 1921. 8vo. 655 pp.

Z dějin české literatury. Sborník statí, věnovaný Jaroslavu Vlčkovi k šedesátinám od jeho spolupracovníků a žáků. (Collection of Essays dedicated to Vlček on his 60th Birthday by his colleagues and pupils.) Pořádali Miloslav Hýsek a Jan Jakubec. Prague (Jan Laichter), 1920. 8vo. 351 pp.

Zvěřina, L. N. : Antonín Sova. Studie jeho básnického vývoje. (A Study of Sova's Poetical Development.) Praha (Hejda a Tuček), 1919. 8vo. 216 pp.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON, KING'S COLLEGE.

SCHOOL OF SLAVONIC STUDIES.

ADVISORY SLAVONIC COMMITTEE.

The Advisory Slavonic Committee is appointed by the Senate.

Chairman : The LORD TREOWEN, C.B., C.M.G.

Secretary : Professor SIR BERNARD PARES, K.B.E., King's College.

The LORD CARNOCK, P.C., G.C.B. (Chairman of the United Russia Societies Association).

The LORD EMMOTT, P.C., G.C.M.G.

SIR SAMUEL HOARE, Bart., C.M.G., M.P.

SIR CHARLES WAKEFIELD, Bart. (formerly Lord Mayor of London).

SIR ARTHUR EVANS, D.Litt., F.R.S.

PROFESSOR SIR I. GOLLANCZ, Litt.D., F.B.A. (Secretary of the British Academy).

PROFESSOR SIR CHARLES OMAN, K.B.E., M.P.

PROFESSOR SIR E. DENISON ROSS, C.I.E. (Director of the School of Oriental Studies).

SIR MICHAEL SADLER, K.C.S.I. (Vice-Chancellor of the University of Leeds).

PROFESSOR SIR PAUL VINOGRADOV, D.C.L., LL.D., F.B.A. (University of Oxford).

F. R. ANDERTON (Chairman of the London County Council).

PROFESSOR H. G. ATKINS (King's College).

ERNEST BARKER, LL.D. (Principal of King's College).

Mrs. RONALD BURROWS.

Colonel G. CROSFIELD, D.S.O.

M. W. DONALD (Board of Trade).

PROFESSOR NEVILL FORBES (Professor of Slavonic Languages in the University of Oxford).

E. A. BRAYLEY HODGETTS (Chairman of the Russian Section of the London Chamber of Commerce).

ALBERT MANSBRIDGE (Chairman of the World Association for Adult Education).

PROFESSOR A. P. NEWTON, D.Litt. (Professor of Imperial History, King's College).

PROFESSOR A. J. SARGENT (The London School of Economics).

S. T. SHOVELTON (Secretary of King's College).

PROFESSOR R. W. SETON-WATSON (Professor of Central European History, King's College).

Lieutenant-Colonel F. C. TANNER, C.M.G., D.S.O. (War Office).

PROFESSOR M. V. TROFIMOV (Professor of Russian in the University of Manchester).

LESLIE URQUHART (Chairman of the British Russia Club).

C. HAGBERG WRIGHT, LL.D. (Librarian of the London Library).

ROBERT F. YOUNG (Hon. Secretary of the Czech Society of Great Britain).

STAFF.

Administrative Director—Professor Sir BERNARD PARES, K.B.E.

Comparative Slavonic Philology—N. B. JOPSON (Reader).

Russian Department—PROFESSOR PARES.

Russian Language - - - A. RAFFI (Lecturer).

Russian Literature - - - Prince D. SVYATOPOLK-MIRSKY (Lecturer).

Russian History - - - Sir B. PARES (Professor).

Ethnography of Russia - - - HAROLD WILLIAMS, Ph.D. (Lecturer).

Russian Laws and Institutions - } Baron A. F. MEYENDORFF (Reader).

Russian Economic Conditions - }

Polish Department—

Polish Language and Literature { ROMAN DYBOSKI, Ph.D., Professor of
English Literature in the University of
Cracow (temporary).
L. WHARTON (Lecturer).

Central European Department—Professor SETON-WATSON.

Central European History - R. W. SETON-WATSON, D.Litt.
(Professor).

Czechoslovak Language and Literature O. VOČADLO, Ph.D. (Lecturer).

Serbo-Croat Language and Literature D. SUBOTIĆ, Ph.D. (Lecturer).

Librarian - - - L. WHARTON (of the British Museum).
Travelling Students of the School { T. O. HIRST, Ph.D. (Czechoslovakia).
H. T. CHESHIRE (Czechoslovakia).

COURSES OF STUDY.

Bachelor of Arts, Honours.—Russian, Polish, Czechoslovak, Yugoslav. In each of these subjects the student can take *either* philology and literature *or* history and economics. In each case, either of the two subjects named can be taken as a special study, and the other as subsidiary. The following extra subsidiary subjects are required: for philology, another European language, preferably German; for literature, another European literature; for history, modern European history from Peter the Great; for economics, modern economic history and organisation from 1800.

Bachelor of Arts, Pass.—Russian, Polish, Czechoslovak, Yugoslav. In each of these groups the subjects are as follows: translation and composition; history including laws and institutions, together with political geography; *either* literature, *or* economics with economic geography.

Bachelor of Commerce (at the London School of Economics).—The student may specialise in his final year of study in the economic conditions of Russia.

Diploma.—Russian, Polish, Czechoslovak, Yugoslav. In each of these groups the subjects are as follows: translation and composition; history including laws and institutions, together with political geography; literature, more particularly as one of the principal expressions of social history; economics with economic geography. The Diploma need not involve Matriculation and does not confer a University Degree.

Certificates.—There is a University Certificate in Russian. A College Certificate in Russian is also obtainable after an intensive course of five months or more in the language.

Journalism.—Students can take Russian as one of the subjects qualifying for the University Diploma in Journalism.

Public Lectures.—Contemporary Russia from 1861 (18), Professor Pares; Austria-Hungary from 1867 (10), and Serbia and the Yugoslav Movement (10), Professor Seton-Watson; Russian Reconstruction (4), Baron Meyendorff; Pushkin, Leskov and Blok (3), Prince D. S. Mirsky; The Original Home of the Slavs (1), N. B. Jopson; Slavonic Studies since Dobrovský (3), and Modern Czech Novelists (3), Dr. O. Vočadlo; Poetry and Politics in the nineteenth century (1), The Polish Peasant in History and Literature (1), The Religious Factor in Polish National Life (1), The Great Periods of Polish Literature (4), Professor R. Dyboski; Some Poetry of Mickiewicz (1), Slowacki and the King Spirit (1), L. Wharton; Post-War Poetry in Poland (1), F. Sobienowski; The Rise of Modern Bulgaria (2), Lady Grogan; Bohemian Exiles in England in the xviiith Century (1), R. F. Young.

The King's College Russian Society, consisting of students and their friends, meets weekly on Saturdays to hear single lectures on current questions, mostly given in Russian.

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD :

Professor of Slavonic Languages : Professor NEVILL FORBES.

Bachelor of Arts, Honours, Russian. Two Years' Course mostly linguistic and literary, but history, social and political, especially the former, are also included both in the lectures and in the examination.

Courses of old Bulgarian, the history of the Russian language and the history of Russian literature are given in rotation.

A composition class, besides private tuition, is held for two hours weekly.

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE :

Reader in Russian : Dr. A. P. GOUDY.

Bachelor of Arts, Honours. Part I. Translation, composition, essay in Russian. Part II. Historical and comparative philology; literature and history; Russian literature, thought and history since 1700; Russian history since 1800, specially Russian economic and social conditions since 1856; Russian history, life and literature before 1700; history and institutions of Slavonic peoples. Church Slavonic, Old Russian and Lithuanian can be offered as supplementary subjects. A Certificate of competent knowledge can also be taken. Other Slavonic languages may be taken in Part I.

A class in Russian for naval officers and others is also held.

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW :

Reader in Russian, HUGH BRENNAN.

Bachelor of Arts, Honours and Pass. Russian can be taken as an optional language in a group of modern languages.

Lectures are given in Russian literature, history and economics.

Elementary classes are also held both in the University and in the Glasgow and West of Scotland Commercial College.

UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL :

School of Russian Studies. Professor of Russian History, Language and Literature: A. BRUCE BOSWELL; Lecturer in Russian: B. S. SLEPCHENKO; Research Fellow in the Ethnography of Russia (non-resident): HAROLD WILLIAMS, Ph.D.

Honours Degree Course in Arts.—Three Years' Course. First year: Language, literature, history, and economics; Second and Third years: Literature or history or economics, dissertation.

Degree in Commerce.—Candidates for this degree may take Russian as a special subject in the Second and Third years of the Course.

Ordinary Degree Course in Arts.—Under the head of Russian, the student may select two of the following:—

- (a) Language and literature.
- (b) History.
- (c) Economics.

University Certificate in Russian.—The single subject, Russian, in the Ordinary Degree can be taken without any others for the Certificate. Two Years' Course. Matriculation not required.

[The Russian Library of the School numbers about 4,000 volumes. The Russian Society, including students and their friends, meets for discussion and study.]

UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER :

Professor of Russian, Professor M. V. TROFIMOV.

Bachelor of Arts, Honours. Translation; essay; Old Slavonic and Old Russian texts; history of the language; outlines of the literature; outlines of the history of Russian civilisation.

Bachelor of Arts, Pass. The Russian language.

Elementary classes are also held. Russian can also be offered in the examination for the Degree of Bachelor of Commerce. Evening classes can be taken both for B.A. Pass and for B. Com.

UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM :

Professor of Russian, Professor H. J. W. TILLYARD.

B.A., Honours Degree. Three courses are given in Russian: Elementary, Middle and Advanced.

A course is held for commerce students, including commercial geography, natural resources, institutions and trading methods. Lectures in Russian are given on Russian literature and life. Three courses are also given in the Birmingham and Midland Institute.

UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS :

Lecturer in Russian: J. KOLNY-BALOTSKY.

Russian can be taken either for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts or for the Degree with Honours. The subject includes language, literature, history, institutions, and the achievements of Russian scholars in art and science.

Russian can be taken for the Diploma in Commerce. Elementary classes are also given.

Elementary teaching in Russian is provided in the Hull Central School of Commerce.

UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD :

Lecturer in Russian : G. A. BIRKETT.

Bachelor of Arts. Russian can be taken either as a primary or as a secondary subject. Elementary classes are also held.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, NOTTINGHAM :

Professor of Russian, Professor JANKO LAVRIN.

Three Years' Course : (a) classes for students of Russian language and literature ; with this course is combined one in Serbian for purposes of comparison ; (b) course in Russian for students of commerce.

The professor is delivering in the second term a course of public lectures on the Political and Cultural Development of the Slavonic Race.

A Russian Society meets for study and discussion.

CONFERENCES OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS
OF RUSSIAN AND OTHER SLAVONIC LANGUAGES.

Chairman of Conference - - - Professor N. FORBES (Oxford).

Secretary of Conference - - - A. RAFFI (London).

Chairman of Standing Committee - Professor Sir B. PARES (London).

Chairman of Philological Committee Professor N. FORBES.

Committee for Questions on Books - Mr. L. WHARTON, Baron A. F. MEYENDORFF, Prince D. S. MIRSKY.

The Conference is attended by representatives from all the British universities concerned, and meets once or twice a year to discuss all questions relating to scholarship and to the advancement of Slavonic Studies.

The Conference has agreed that university students should be allowed to work either in the new or in the old spelling of Russian at their own choice, so long as they adhere consistently to one or the other system.

The Conference in October, 1921, recommended the following system of transliteration of Russian:—

а — a	л — l	ч — ch
б — b	м — m	ш — sh
в — v	н — n	щ — shch
г — g (h)	о — o	ъ — omit
д — d	п — p	ы — i
е — e	р — r	ь — '
ё — ë	с — s	ѣ — e
ж — zh	т — t	э — e
з — z	у — u	ю — yu
и } — i	ф — f	я — ya
і } — i	х — kh	ѳ — t
й — y	ц — ts	ѵ — i
к — k		

g (h) is admissible in retransliterating from the Russian foreign words such as Hugo.

Final y is to be optional when it is the second half of the diphthong *ий* (-iy) if *final and unstressed*, in such names as :

Горькій — Gor'ki,
Достоевскій — Dostoevski(y) ;

but it is obligatory when this diphthong is final and *stressed*, e.g.

ви́й — viy.

Likewise it is obligatory when this diphthong occurs medially, stressed or unstressed, *e.g.*

Новоросійскъ — Novorossiysk.

This final y is obligatory in all other diphthongs, whether medial or final, whether stressed or unstressed, *e.g.*

красивый — krasivŷy.
 коломыйка — kolomŷyka.
 Толстой — Tolstoy.
 край — kray.

The apostrophe is retained to denote the soft sign, except in names already anglicised, *e.g.* Sebastopol, Astrakhan, Archangel; but Khar'kov, Kazan', Kol'tsov.

Note.—In this Review the principles recommended by the Conference are generally followed, subject to a few variations in detail.

OTHER SLAVONIC ORTHOGRAPHIES.

Polish.	Czech Slovak.	Serbo-Croat Slovene.	
c	c	c	= ts in "cats."
cz	č	č	= ch in "church."
č	—	č	= (a sound between č and tj).
ch	ch	h	= h in "hard."
sz	š	š	= sh in "ship."
ž	ž	ž	= j in French "jour."
dž	—	d, gj	= J in "Jew."
—	d'	dj	= d in "due."
ie	ě	je	= y in "yet."
l	l'	lj	= l in "collusion."
ń	ň	nj	= n in "new."
—	t'	tj	= t in "tune."
rz	ř	—	= rzh.
ř	—	—	= sound approximating to w.
w	v	v	= v in "view."

For Bulgarian the same diacritic signs are used as for Serbo-Croat.

German, Hungarian and Roumanian are transcribed each according to its own orthography.

RUSSIAN WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

1 Verst	-	-	-	-	=	0.66 miles.
1 Sazhen	-	-	-	-	=	2.33 yards.
1 Arshin	-	-	-	-	=	0.77 yards.
1 Square Verst	-	-	-	-	=	281.22 acres.
1 Desyatina	-	-	-	-	=	2.69 acres.
1 Vedro	-	-	-	-	=	2.70 gallons.
1 Chetvert	-	-	-	-	=	5.77 Imperial bushels.
1 Pud	-	-	-	-	=	0.32 cwt.
1 Funt	-	-	-	-	=	0.90 lb. (Avoir du pois.)

(These calculations we owe to the courtesy of the London Chamber of Commerce, Russian Section).

PUBLICATIONS OF THE SCHOOL.

THE Editors beg to announce the first of a series of publications in connection with the School of Slavonic Studies :—

The Historian as a Political Force in Central Europe

(being the Inaugural Lecture delivered on 2 November, 1922, by R. W. Seton-Watson, as Professor of Central European History in the University of London). Price 2s. net.

[N.B.—This is being sent gratis to all annual subscribers to the SLAVONIC REVIEW.]

This will shortly be followed by :—

The Distribution and Inter-relations of the Slavonic Peoples and Languages

(being the Inaugural Lecture delivered on 30 November, 1922, by N. B. Jopson, Reader in Comparative Slavonic Philology in the University of London). Price 2s. net.

Other publications, on a larger scale, will, it is hoped, be announced in the third number.

For reasons of space it has been found necessary to hold over till the next number an obituary notice of the Czech sculptor Myslbek, by Professor F. Chudoba, a survey of the leading Slav reviews published since the War, and several important reviews.

The Editors also much regret that a supplementary note by Professor Jagić to his article "A Survey of Slavistic Studies" in No. 1 reached them too late for insertion in the present number. It will be published in No. 3, together with an appreciation of Jagić's own work, by his pupil, Professor Pasternek, of Prague.

TEACHERS OF RUSSIAN AND OTHER SLAVONIC LANGUAGES
IN GREAT BRITAIN.

We propose, at a later date, to print a map of Great Britain showing at which places teaching in these languages can be obtained; and we shall be glad to receive the names and addresses of any such teachers, whether in London or the provinces, of which a register will be kept for the purpose of answering any inquiries which may be addressed to us.

ERRATA IN No. I.

Page 51, line 7. *For Koulek read Koubek.*

Page 57, line 2 from foot. *For Filologické read Filologický.*

Page 58, line 8. *For Filologický read Filologický.*

Page 58, line 10. *For Živinoslovenski read Južnoslovenski.*

Page 88. The footnote belongs not to this page, but to the final paragraph on page 92.

Page 240, line 12 of table. *For Czech Technical High School, Brno, read German ditto.*

CONTRIBUTORS TO No. 2.

CONSTANTINE SKIRMUNT, the newly appointed Polish Minister in London, was Minister to the Vatican from 1918 till 1921, when he became Foreign Minister. Last April he represented Poland at the Conference of Genoa.

STANISLAS KUTRZEBA is Professor in the University of Cracow and a foremost Polish authority on constitutional law. He took a part in drafting the new Constitution.

LOUIS EISENMANN is Ernest Denis, Professor of Slavonic History and Civilisation at the University of Paris, and M. Denis's successor at the Institut des Études Slaves. He is author of an important volume on Austrian constitutional history (*Le Compromis Austro-Hongrois de 1867*) and of works on Czechoslovakia, etc.

R. W. SETON-WATSON is Professor of Central European History in the University of London, joint-editor of this review, and author of various books on Austro-Hungarian and Balkan history.

ARNE NOVÁK is Professor of Literature at the University of Brno (Brünn), and well known both as a novelist and as an authority on Czech literature.

MICHAEL GAVRILOVIC is Minister of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes in London, and a distinguished Serbian historian and archivist; author of the standard *Life of Miloš Obrenović* and other historical works.

EUGENE LYATSKY, to-day Professor of Russian Literature at the Czech University of Prague, is a well-known literary historian and critic, and has published a standard work on Goncharov and editions of such Russian classics as Krylov, Lermontov and Griboyedov.

ROSA NEWMARCH is well known as a musical critic, and did more than anyone to make Russian music known in this country. She is the author of a life of Chaykovsky and books on Russian music and "The Russian Opera." Her book on the Czechoslovak Opera is to appear shortly.

BASIL SHULGIN represented Kiev in the Second, Third and Fourth Dumas, and was editor of the *Kievanin*. He was one of the chief spokesmen of the Nationalist group in the Progressive *bloc* of 1915.

SERGIUS BULGAKOV was for many years Professor of Economics in Kiev and Moscow, and is one of the foremost living authorities on Russian religious questions. During the Revolution he took holy orders and now ranks high as an Orthodox theologian.

MARGARET S. MILLER is a post-graduate student of the School of Slavonic Studies and of the London School of Economics.

JOSEF DRACHOVSKÝ is Professor of Economics at the Czech University of Prague.

THE SLAVONIC REVIEW.

VOL. I. NO. 2.

DECEMBER 1922.

POLAND.

[As a preface to the following articles on Poland, I should like to repeat what I wrote in the *Russian Review* of August, 1913. "It is because the Pole, to his deep distress, feels his wounded nationality at every turn, that he has it still, and that he carries the pledge of its development in the future, and it is because Polish nationality, instead of dying, extends further and roots itself deeper, that the Polish question claims increasingly a foremost place in the interests of Europe. Poland becomes more and more the touchstone of the three Powers which partitioned her." It was with these feelings at heart (for the appeal of the wounded Polish sense of nationality, probably the acutest and strongest in Europe, made its appeal direct to the heart) that the *Russian Review* then printed a whole series of articles on Poland, contributed by the generosity of Polish scholars and public men, and that at the same time the first university post in this subject was instituted in the University of Liverpool. THE SLAVONIC REVIEW and the School of Slavonic Studies, with their much wider reference, will continue to give a prominent place to questions relating to Poland.

Nowhere is this work more urgently needed than in England. Two years ago, with the Bolshevik armies at the gates of Warsaw and the whole peace settlement in imminent danger, Kamenev, the official representative of the Soviet Government in England, was able to foment a movement for "Direct Action" on the Polish issue. This would not have been possible but for the entire ignorance of the subject in England. For instance, in no Labour organ has one come across any mention of the fact that Poland has gone farther than any other country in the matter of a levy on capital! Poland is too often made a plaything of party witticisms, and the most fundamental facts relating to the tragic past and to the extraordinarily difficult present conditions of the country are unknown and ignored.

If there is anywhere a passion for national liberty, it is claimed in advance by the position of Poland. The greatest period in the history of this people is that in which it passed through a school of suffering such as hardly any other people has experienced, and yet lived—not on the

map of Europe, but by spiritual experience. Liberation has come at last, but Poland, so long severed, with three imperial frontiers meeting over her hearthstone, is now faced with the task of growing together again, which is described below—a task which must claim the sympathy of all who think in terms not of governments, but of peoples. For its success she has at last the first requisite of all peoples, the control of her own destiny.—BERNARD PARES.]

ALTHOUGH four years have passed since Poland rose again as an independent State, public opinion abroad does not seem to have become quite familiar yet with the existence of this State of 386,000 square kilometres of area and 27 millions of inhabitants. The one hundred and twenty odd years during which there was no Poland in the family of nations, have had the effect that the tasks of the old Poland, and the part it played on the stage of European affairs, were utterly forgotten. It will, accordingly, not seem superfluous to remind the readers of the *Slavonic Review* that in the Middle Ages the flood of Tartar invasion, which overwhelmed the whole of Russia, was stemmed by Poland. Shedding its best blood, Poland defended both itself and the neighbouring countries for many centuries against the wave of Mussulman attack from the East, and the last time this wave was broken, at the gates of Vienna in 1683, it was Polish strength that broke it.

The re-born Poland of our days has not ceased to be the outpost of Western civilisation, defending its culture against new perils from the East. In Poland itself that culture is evidently strong and vital enough, since it has been able, at the end of 1918 and early in 1919, to hold its own against Bolshevism, raging at that time not in Russia only, but in Hungary too, and even in Germany, in its phase of revolutionary ferment.

Civilisation held its own again in Poland and through Poland in the August days of 1920, when all the world seemed ready to believe that victorious Muscovite Bolshevism would gain a firm footing on the banks of the Vistula. Civilisation held its own then, and will hold its own still, because its inner forces are too much alive to perish easily, and it is made, in Poland, of a stuff which the rust of Eastern anarchy does not eat through. But it is of vital importance that no other rust of any kind should eat through it either.

The conditions under which the new Poland arose were extremely difficult. Divided into three parts, the country had lived for a hundred years under different systems of law, of political administration, and economic organisation. From the

very first days of the new re-united existence, the hard task of unification within had to be taken in hand.

The country, besides, was ruined from end to end by war, with the exception of the part occupied by the Germans, which did not, at least, suffer actual devastation after the first ravages of war (such as the burning of the town of Kalisz in 1914), but which certainly had to share with Germany itself all the burdens, losses and privations of four years' warfare and blockade. All the other parts of Poland were traversed again and again by fighting armies: the eastern part of Russian Poland was ruthlessly changed into a desert by the retreating Russians in 1915, and a great part of its population scattered over the immense wastes of Russia and Siberia, from which many have not yet returned, and many never will return. Eastern Galicia was the territory of offensives and counter-offensives almost year by year from 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917—until the recent wars there between Poles and Ukrainians, and Poles and Bolsheviks.

A country plunged into this condition by the war had to be made habitable again; country towns which were lying in ruins, and villages which had entirely disappeared, had to be re-built; factories, of which the machinery had been carried away either by Russians or Germans, had to be made to work again; industrial and agricultural production had to be raised anew from the very low level—a level nearly of zero in many instances—to which it had sunk during the war.

The Polish State never had in history, and it does not have now, any natural frontiers, except the Carpathian mountains on the southern border. In its present composition it has, in its eastern part, extensive provinces with a mixed population. The frontiers were only partly defined by the Peace Treaties: they had in a large part to be created by Poland's own effort, and it was by unaided Polish effort also that conditions as favourable as possible had to be produced for the existence and development of all sections and classes of the population.

These are indeed enormous tasks, and of gigantic difficulty. They require the utmost strain of the whole nation's forces, and they mark out for Poland, very clearly, a road of huge and distinctly peaceful labour in the immediate future.

Much has already been done, as Professor Kutrzeba, in his able article in the present number of *THE SLAVONIC REVIEW*, attempts to show in detail to English readers, uninformed of Poland's recent progress.

Industry, and particularly agriculture, have revived. More

than one of the important and richly-developed industries of pre-war Poland—especially the textile industry of the district of Łódź—have returned to their former level of output, and are beginning to rise beyond it.

The General Election which has recently been held in Poland, and given it a two-chamber Parliament to replace the Constituent Assembly, has passed in perfect tranquillity and order, although the most active interest was taken in it by the large mass of electors; the actual participation of voters at the polls rose, in some parts of Poland, above 90 per cent., and nowhere fell below 60 per cent., of the numerous body of citizens, both male and female, who possess the franchise under the provisions of nearly universal suffrage and proportional representation, which are part of the thoroughly democratic Polish Constitution of 17 March, 1921.

The tasks before Poland being essentially tasks of peace, work upon them necessarily brings the policy of Poland into close relations with the policy of all countries which have a vital interest in the maintenance of the state of peace as established by the treaties which ended the Great War. This interest links up Poland both with the Powers of the Great and the Little Entente and with the new Baltic States. The great international conferences held in the current year in Genoa and at the Hague gave Poland opportunities to prove her manifest, earnest and sincere good-will for collaboration in all joint endeavours to make peace permanent. It is safe to say, on the part of one who himself shared, to the best of his powers, in these efforts, that no one of those who, at Genoa and elsewhere, sat at one table with the delegates of the Polish Republic, can have failed to become convinced that Poland desires to be, and is, a factor of order, peace and work in the New Europe.

CONSTANTINE SKIRMUNT.

POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS IN POLAND.

POLAND as re-created by the Peace Treaties had to attack two equally difficult tasks: firstly, that of repairing the ravages of war, secondly of organising territories that had belonged to three different Powers into one united State. The enormous extent of these tasks is not always duly appreciated in the West, especially in view of the fact that Poland was far from being sufficiently equipped with the material and moral resources necessary for such an effort.

It is true that the extent of Poland's losses through the war cannot be compared with those suffered by France. The devastated regions of France were a territory of very high culture, densely populated, full of factories and mines. But, at any rate, this was only one-seventh of the total area of France (not including the colonies), and France is an extraordinarily rich country. The culture of Poland is not so high, it is true, and the country is pre-eminently agricultural, and therefore better able to endure the ravages of war. And it is true, also, that the principal centres of Polish culture—the historical cities of Warsaw, Cracow, Lwow, Vilna, and Poznań—escaped destruction; but the dimensions of territory repeatedly flooded by different and equally hostile armies was *six-sevenths* of Poland's total area, while barely one-seventh of the country was not immediately affected by the war, viz., the Prussian provinces and the Western fringe of Austrian Poland. The figures adduced below will make it evident how great, however, were the losses that Poland suffered in buildings, in her agriculture, in her industries, and in her railways. These losses it was not easy to repair. France came to the assistance of her devastated provinces with ample succour, amounting to milliards of francs, which were drawn partly from the Treasury of the Republic and partly from German reparation payments. Poland got no reparations either from Germany or from Austria, and the National Treasury was not able to give sufficient relief, since Poland is so much poorer in capital than France, and the devastated area was, in this case, almost the whole country.

Besides these difficulties, however, Poland had still others to overcome in the organisation of its state life, in view of the fact that political unity had to be created out of three sections, and even more legal systems—four or five, in fact. For the part of the country governed by Prussia was organised quite differently from that which belonged to Austria; it had another legislative apparatus, another administrative machinery, other laws and courts of law. On the territory of Russian Poland, again, two different legal systems were in operation: one in the former “kingdom” as constituted by the Congress of Vienna, and another to the east of it. The “kingdom” institutions of the former epoch were still extant: the *Code Napoléon* for civil law, and an essentially French code of commercial law. Eastward of the kingdom, in provinces also belonging to Poland now, a strictly Russian social order, with rigid class division into gentry, burghers, and peasants, was the basis of law, and the Russian Code (*Svod Zakonov*) was dominant. Finally, there were certain distinctively Hungarian institutions and laws in the territories adjudged to Poland by the Ambassadors’ Council on July 28, 1920 (the districts of Spiš (Zips) and Orava).

In this respect, then, Poland’s position was incomparably more difficult than that of any other of the new States created by the Peace Treaties. Czecho-Slovakia, Lithuania, Latvia, Finland, or Esthonia were, each of them, cut out of one State organism, and had uniform institutions and laws to deal with, so that in all these cases it was sufficient to establish central authorities in order to set up a provisional State organisation. Roumania and Jugoslavia had, even before the war, their ready-made organisations, to which the newly-acquired territories had merely to be subjected. Poland, accordingly, had to create new common institutions and laws distinct from each of the three extant legal systems, because none of these was fit to be made a national basis: they were all foreign to Polish legal thought and tradition, and the system governing the largest part of the country—Russian Poland—was far too reactionary and antiquated to be considered even as a starting-point for the new work.

While capital was wanting for the economic reconstruction of Poland, no less acute was the lack of men prepared to undertake the work of political reconstruction. Polish administrative officials, judges, and teachers existed only in the Austrian sector. In Prussian Poland, Poles had been debarred almost entirely from positions in the administration, the courts, and the schools; in

Russian Poland, only a very small number of Poles had been employed in inferior administrative service, in the law as unpaid municipal judges, and in the schools only as elementary school-masters; all the higher posts (in secondary schools, universities, courts of law, and administrative offices) were held by Russians.

In addition to this, the whole work of economic reconstruction and State organisation had to be conducted under conditions of harassing political uncertainty, with undefined frontiers. The Versailles Treaty had given definite frontiers to Poland only on the Western (German) border, and even here in two sections the settlement was postponed until a plebiscite had expressed the will of the people (in Upper Silesia and West and East Prussia). The frontiers between Poland and Czecho-Slovakia were only drawn by the Ambassadors' Council on July 28, 1920. The inclusion of Eastern Galicia in Poland has not yet received the sanction of the Powers¹; the frontiers with Lithuania are still undecided, and with Russia there was war that was only ended by a Preliminary Peace on October 12, 1920, and by a definitive Peace Treaty on March 18, 1921. This at last defined the Eastern frontier, but again the frontier has not been sanctioned so far by the Powers, who had reserved for themselves by the Versailles Treaty (agreed to by Poland) a voice in the matter.

The war with Russia impeded reconstructive work and brought new devastations. The uncertainty of the frontiers was a serious obstacle in framing a Constitution and an administrative organism, for both are largely dependent on the extent of territory, and on the numbers, character, and ethnical composition of the population. Yet, in spite of all these difficulties, the economic reconstruction of the country has been accomplished, and the former three parts have to a considerable degree been unified into an organised political whole.

I.—ECONOMIC RECONSTRUCTION.

1. *Buildings*.—Although—as stated above—the buildings destroyed by the war in Poland do not represent the same value as those ruined in France, yet their destruction did immense harm to the rising new State, by depriving millions of people of their

¹ On 25 June, 1919, the Supreme Council granted permission for a temporary Polish occupation of Eastern Galicia, but undertook that its political status should be settled later in accordance with the wishes of the population. By Art. 91 of the Treaty of St. Germain "all rights and title" over former Austrian territory "not at present assigned to any State" (and therefore over Galicia) were transferred to the Principal Allied and Associated Powers.—ED.

dwellings and demolishing the homes of learning, religion, law, and government. The Minister of Finance, Dr. Michalski, in his Budget speech of March 28, 1922, submitted to the Constituent Assembly the exact figures of these damages, as well as an account, in figures, of what had actually been done in the way of reconstruction. According to these statistics, the number of buildings destroyed in Poland is 1,546,892. Of these, 674,036, or 43 per cent., had been rebuilt by the end of 1921. So there remained to be rebuilt 872,855 buildings, of which 263,138 were dwellings, 604,359 farm-buildings, 3,146 schools, 1,078 churches, and 1,134 public buildings of various sorts.

The State, by the end of 1921, had spent 6,700,000,000 Polish marks on rebuilding, and in 1922 a credit of 11,480,000,000 was voted for the purpose. Considering the purchasing power of the Polish mark, these are not very large sums; if, nevertheless, they have served to advance reconstruction so far, that is due to the great effort of the population, who did the rebuilding largely out of their own pocket and with their own hands, with the help of material obtained from the State, particularly of timber supplied at a low price from State forests, or from stores of timber requisitioned for purposes of reconstruction.

2. *Agriculture*.—Agriculture had suffered great damage during the war, when cultivated fields were dug up into trenches, and the fertile upper strata of soil were injured by gun-fire. But infinitely more harm was done by the fact that large numbers of people left their homes when war raged in their neighbourhood, and much ground remained untilled for years. During the Russian retreat of 1915 the army was ordered to take the civilian population with it into Russia, using compulsion where needed, and thus it happened that about a million Polish emigrants were scattered over Russia and Siberia, most of whom, after years of utter distress under the Bolsheviks, are only returning now.

In consequence of military operations and want of workers, no less than 4,646,000 hectares of land, which means a quarter (25·4 per cent.) of the entire soil of Poland, lay waste as late as 1919, chiefly in the Eastern provinces. In 1920 this area was reduced to 2,511,000 hectares, or 14·3 per cent. of the total. In the spring of 1921, after termination of the war with the Bolsheviks, there were only 1,133,000 hectares, or 6·4 per cent., of waste land left. This shows how intensively reconstruction was conducted here. The spring of 1922, when farmers at last could really go to their work in quiet and without hindrance, further reduced the area of uncultivated land to 370,000, or 2·1 per cent. of Poland's

arable soil, and even this margin has almost totally disappeared in the course of the year.

Here it must be pointed out that if there has been a marked falling-off, in all countries, in the productiveness of mining and industrial labour, the Polish farmer, who had always been distinguished by his capacity for intense work, has lost nothing of it in this period. On the contrary, he has given proof of increased energy, as abundantly manifested by the above figures; and the favourable state of the market for the produce of his toil was another propitious factor.

As a result of all this, the year 1922 brought a thorough change in the matter of the import and export of food. In 1919 and 1920 Poland was not able to feed its own population with the grain it produced. Large quantities were imported from America, and to this was principally due the bad state of Poland's trade balance. By 1920 production already almost covered the needs of the country, and a certain quantity of potatoes (40,000 tons) were exported, chiefly to Germany. In the current year, 1922, official statistics after the harvest have established that the production of grain, in spite of a considerable increase in domestic consumption—from 100 to 170 kilogrammes per head and year in war-time—not only fully covers the needs of the population, but makes possible an export of more than half a million tons.¹ The potato crop amounted to about 19,000,000 tons, of which about 2,000,000 could be exported, if export were not hampered by the insufficiency of rolling stock. Permission to export 200,000 tons of potatoes and 70,000 tons of barley has already been given. The sugar-beet crop has also risen considerably, to two and a half million tons of sugar, which is 420,000 tons more than in 1921: an export of at least 100,000–150,000 tons of sugar is anticipated. The number of horses (3,200,000 according to the census of September 1, 1921) and of cattle (8,100,000) has reached the pre-war level, and of pigs and sheep there are about 1,000,000 more than before the War, so that export would be possible without loss to the country.

3. *Industry*.—Before the war there was considerable industrial activity in Russian Poland, particularly at Łódź (the Polish Manchester), in Warsaw, and in the coal basin round Dabrowa Gornicza. The war dealt it a terrible blow. Almost all factories came to a standstill. There were two reasons for this. Firstly, the Russian authorities, before withdrawing from Russian Poland,

¹ Production, 6,339,000 tons; consumption, 4,411,000 tons; seed-grain, 1,048,000 tons; balance, 879,000 tons.

evacuated most of the factory machinery into the interior of Russia. In spite of the provisions of the Treaty of Riga, this machinery has not yet been restored to Poland, and the first instalments of it have only just begun to arrive. German requisitions were even worse.

It is a fact well established now by the Memoirs of Count Czernin and the confidential reports of General Beseler, the Prussian Governor of Warsaw, that the tendency of the German *régime* was to suppress entirely the industry that had developed in Poland. In exporting to Russia, it was a competitor with German industry. The competitor was to disappear, and Poland itself was to become a *hinterland* for German industry. Accordingly, during the German occupation of Poland, both machines and important parts of them (chiefly brass) were taken out of the country, and so were raw materials whenever discovered. Thus industry was to be immobilised. About 1,000 electrical motors and dynamos thus found their way to Germany, besides 1,375 tons of brass and copper parts of machines, 1,300 kilometres' length of transmission belts, and, of raw materials, 23,000 tons of cotton and 20,000 tons of wool. The losses of the one big factory town of Łódź alone were estimated at 175 million dollars, the prices being calculated at pre-war level. The restoration of industrial property by the Germans only began, to any extent worth speaking of, in 1921.

The reconstruction of Polish industry, then, has taken place under circumstances of unparalleled difficulty; and yet it has progressed. In factories of woollen manufactures the output in 1920 was only at 19 per cent. of its pre-war level; in 1921 it rose to 40 per cent., in 1922 it is at 50. Production in the cotton industry in 1920 was not more than 40 per cent. of the pre-war output; in 1921 it rose to 60, in 1922 to 90 per cent. Metallurgy reached 50 per cent. in 1921, and is near 80 per cent. now.

Coal mines had suffered little, and accordingly got back to the pre-war output sooner; in the current year they have even gone beyond it—to 105·24 per cent. Iron ore is at 80 per cent., although the number of mines which are active is less by five than before the War.

The result of this state of things is that Poland suffers much less from unemployment trouble than England or America. Unemployment was only noticeable after the demobilisation of the large army of 1920, and in connection with a temporary set-back in industrial development. The number of unemployed rose to 221,444 in February, 1922; but it fell to

98,581 by 1 July, and was 69,962 on 26 August. These figures are rapidly decreasing, and it may be mentioned in addition that an outlet for thousands of unemployed is temporarily supplied by reconstruction work in France.

4. *The Railways*.—Two moments in the development of the Polish railway work may be singled out with particular pride. The first of these is the time, in October and November, 1918, when foreign administration was being replaced by Polish in Austrian and Russian Poland: in spite of this sweeping change, railway transport was not interrupted even for a single day, though it was in the hands of Germans in Russian Poland, who had to turn it over to Poles. In Galicia, where the railway *personnel* was already entirely Polish, the problem was simpler.

The second moment was the withdrawal of the rolling stock during the retreat of the Polish Army before the Bolshevik invaders in 1920, which was effected so promptly and skilfully that Poland suffered almost no losses in railway material.

Normal traffic on Polish railways was re-established sooner than in neighbouring countries which had suffered less from the war. But Poland was badly in want of rolling stock. Before the war there were at work on the lines of Russian Poland 1,250 engines, 1,685 passenger carriages, and 34,430 freight cars. At the moment of the Germans' expulsion, there remained behind only 800 engines (fewer by 450), 925 passenger carriages (fewer by 760), and 10,975 freight cars (fewer by 23,455). Things were no better in Galicia, where it became urgently necessary to augment the rolling stock by 1,400 passenger carriages and 24,000 freight cars, in order to satisfy the needs of traffic. Only in Prussian Poland the quantity of rolling stock was almost normal. In addition to such a state of things, difficulties were yet increased by the fact that the Germans and Austrians had, during their occupation, changed the broad tracks of Russian type, wherever extant, to the narrower Central European gauge. In doing so, they cut down the sleepers to normal length, so that broad tracks could not be restored. Accordingly, even if Russia had restored to Poland the rolling stock which had gone out of the country, it could not be used again in Poland. That is why Poland, in concluding the Riga Peace, resigned all claims on Russia for the return of rolling stock for broad-track lines.

At present, railway traffic in Poland has returned to a fairly satisfactory condition. The stations burnt down during the war have been rebuilt; existing ones have been enlarged, as in Warsaw or at Cracow. The Germans, under the provisions of the

Versailles Treaty, were obliged to provide Poland with rolling stock for the lines of which they had narrowed the tracks. A considerable number of engines were bought in America, while a Polish engine factory is in course of construction near Cracow. The number of engines is 4,300 at present; carriages, particularly freight cars, are being supplied by the enlarged factories at Czenstochowa (Russian Poland), Sanok (Austrian Poland), and Ostrowo (Prussian Poland). At this time there are 85,000 cars running in Poland, not counting those outside the boundaries of the Republic. The export difficulties occasioned by insufficiency of rolling stock have already been mentioned. Since the recent inclusion of Upper Silesia in Poland, similar difficulties, originating in the same cause, have arisen with regard to the dispersion of Silesian coal over Poland, and to the supply of food from the interior of Poland to the mining districts of Silesia. These difficulties were increased by the fact that Germany, when a Joint Committee delimited the actual frontiers, succeeded in retaining some important railway junctions, with buildings and tracks adapted to the traffic of a mining district.

Passenger traffic in Poland is adequately provided for, both in number of carriages and accuracy of service, the latter being manifested in 1922 by the publication of the first Polish official railway guide, a bulky volume now in its second edition.

II.—POLITICAL UNIFICATION.

1. *Organisation*.—The re-union of the three divided parts of Poland was not an easy task. The differences between institutions in the three parts of the country were very considerable, both as regards type and the powers of administrative and local authorities. This is not the place for a full account of these differences, which are now of purely historical interest. It will suffice to say that it proved impossible to subordinate all authorities immediately to the Central Government, which was partly formed in Warsaw during the German occupation, and completed after the Germans' departure on 11 November, 1918. Both in the Austrian part of Poland (set free early in November, 1918) and in the German part (freed on 28 December, 1918) temporary supreme government authorities arose by the choice of the people, viz., the "Settlement Commission" in Galicia, and the "People's Council," with a body of Commissioners for its executive organ, in Prussian Poland. Shortly afterwards, however, these provincial governments were subordinated to Warsaw in the following manner: in Galicia, a delegate of the Central

Government was appointed head of the administration on 7 March, 1919, and he was the mediator between subordinate authorities and the Warsaw Government until the latter took over the different branches of administration itself. This had been accomplished by 1 September, 1921, and on that day the office of Delegate was abolished.

In Prussian Poland the provincial Polish authorities were all placed under a "Minister for the Affairs of former Prussian Poland" (appointed on 1 September, 1919). By April, 1922, unification had been achieved here likewise, and the Minister disappeared.

Temporary provincial administrations, dependent on Army General Headquarters, also existed in the territories east of the former "Congress kingdom" of Russian Poland; they were abolished after the conclusion of peace with Russia.

In the meantime, the principles of uniform political administration for the whole country had been worked out on the basis of division into counties (called, in old Polish fashion, *województwa*) and urban and rural districts. This division now exists throughout Poland. By a law of 15 July, 1920, a considerable measure of self-government, including a special legislature, has been granted to the county of Silesia (composed of parts of former Prussian and Austrian Silesia), where elections for the legislature have recently taken place. Similarly, a separate statute of self-government was worked out for the three counties of Eastern Galicia (inhabited by a mixed population of Poles and Ukrainians), and this passed into law on 26 September, 1922. Another such statute is planned for the county of Vilna, the population of which is composed of Poles and Lithuanians.¹

Even before political administration had been organised, a general election on a basis of universal and proportional suffrage for all adult men and women was held, and resulted in the formation of Poland's Constituent Assembly or Diet (*Sejm*), which began its sessions on 9 February, 1919, and ended them on 26 September, 1922. By a Bill of 20 February, 1919 (the so-called "Minor Constitution") the powers of the "Chief of State" and his relation to the Diet were defined. Later on, the prolonged labours of the Diet resulted in the proclamation of the so-called "Major Constitution" of 17 March, 1921, composed of 126

¹ It will be remembered that on 9 October, 1920, Vilna was occupied by Polish troops under General Zeligowski, and is still in Polish hands. The attempts of the Supreme Council and of the Council of the League of Nations to produce a settlement of the Polish-Lithuanian dispute have hitherto proved unsuccessful, both parties at present refusing the proposed terms.—ED.

articles, and for the most part carried into operation before autumn, 1922. At present the Constituent Assembly having dissolved itself after the completion of its preparatory work, another general election, likewise on a basis of universal and proportional suffrage, is being held; it will result in a two-chamber Parliament, composed of a Senate and a Chamber of Deputies.

The Constituent Assembly prepared in committee a complete scheme of urban and rural self-government, which will come before the new Parliament. Before that, in 1920, a more urgent administrative need was satisfied by the creation of a State Police of uniform type, which took the place of the three very different police organisations left behind by the partitioning Powers. In organising the police, the assistance of English police officials was requested, willingly given, and welcomed, as being fitted to impart to the new Polish police the same truly popular character which is the glory of the British police system.

2. *The Army*.—A State needs not only a government, but also an armed force to protect its safety. The position of Poland is one of peculiar danger, as its frontiers are open on all sides (except for the Carpathian mountains in the south), and they are very difficult to defend, the more so as the Paris Congress defined them on principles which could take no account of strategical considerations. Poland had to begin its existence by using force to remove German authorities and troops—it was only the Austrians who withdrew voluntarily—and by conducting three wars: a short but very painful one with the Czechs in Silesia, a protracted one with the Ukrainians for the possession of Lwów and Eastern Galicia, and finally one which required a supreme effort, against the Soviet Government; this lasted for nearly two years, from the end of 1918 to the autumn of 1920.

In November, 1918, the whole armed force at the disposal of Poland was a body of 6,000 men, organised by the Germans and fairly well disciplined. This at once placed itself under the command of the National Government. Joseph Piłsudski, who became Chief of the State on 11 November, 1918, called to arms the secret Polish military organisation formed by himself under the German occupation, and composed of elements which were ardently patriotic in sentiment, if not sufficiently trained as soldiers. In the last days of 1918 Prussian Poland, having removed the Germans, formed an army of its own with a special command: this was raised in a short time to the number of more than 60,000 men, all of them well schooled as soldiers in the ranks of the German Army, and not badly equipped with

arms taken from the Germans. At the same time, there was already in existence in France a Polish Army under General Joseph Haller, which had been organised and excellently trained by French officers. It was composed of American Poles and former prisoners-of-war from the German and Austrian ranks, and was called the "blue army," from the colour of its uniforms, in contrast to the "grey army" in Poland. Admirably equipped with the help of France, it numbered 70,000 men. This Army, however, arrived in Poland only in April, 1919, and was dependent, for political reasons, on the French General Command.

In the meantime an augmentation of the armed force in Poland became urgently necessary. Depots were very thinly manned, equipment and arms were scarce, because Poland had only that to go upon which had been taken from the retiring Austrians and Germans. Moreover, the soldiers were tired out with their long service in foreign armies. For all these reasons, it was impossible to introduce conscription on a large scale at once, and only volunteers could be called to join the colours. These were of course altogether a better element, full of enthusiasm, more intelligent, and therefore more easily trained. As early as March, 1919, the influx of volunteers had raised the strength of the Polish Army (without the separate Army of former Prussian Poland, and without Haller's Army in France to 170,000 men. In the meantime, the Diet voted conscription for one-year recruits; several other years were called in somewhat later. By the end of 1919 the Polish forces—including the remnants of a division formed in Siberia and partly rescued from the welter of Russian events—numbered 600,000; early in 1920, when the smouldering war with Russia became acute, 740,000; and in October, 1920, when the Armistice was concluded, about one million men, including the 80,000 volunteers who had joined up when the Bolsheviks were marching upon Warsaw.

Together with increase of numbers, unification of the Army had to be thought of. This was particularly difficult in view of the very different training the soldiers had received—Prussian, Austrian, Russian, and French. To begin with, Prussian regulations were necessarily adopted (the earliest nucleus being the "Polnische Wehrmacht" organised by the Germans). Only Haller's Army remained distinctly French in type. The separate Army raised in former Prussian Poland was subordinated to the Central Polish Command on 1 August, 1919; Haller's Army, on 1 September of the same year. Half a year before that, on

1 March, 1919, a French Military Mission had arrived in Poland to assist in the introduction of military training and organisation on French models. French tactics and campaign drill were adopted. Uniformity of training and organisation, however, (not to speak of equipment), was far from being established when the war of 1920 called the whole Army, such as it then was, into the field. It stood the test. The work was resumed after the war, together with demobilisation, which was completed in spring, 1922. Bills concerning Army unification were voted by the Diet. Early in 1922 the French Missions could leave the country, and the Polish Army at the present moment is a body uniform in equipment, organisation, and training.

A small Polish Fleet of gunboats exists and is developing in the Baltic, and monitors on the Vistula had their glorious days repelling the Bolshevik advance in 1920.

3. *Finance*.—In this domain, again, Poland had three different systems of taxation to start with. What rendered the task particularly difficult here, was the fact that the weight of taxation was considerably less heavy in Russia than in Prussia or Austria. Besides, the Russian laws were markedly inferior in financial technique, and taxpayers' morality was very low under the Russian *régime*. And it was evident that the difference in taxation had to be resolutely removed, if Poland was to become an economic unit, and if conditions of production were not to exhibit striking contrasts within a united country. For a time it proved inevitable even to retain a customs barrier between former Prussian Poland (which, untouched by the war, was in a particularly favourable economic position) and the rest of the country. This was abolished in July, 1919, and so were, later on (by September, 1921), certain limitations upon trade between this and other parts of Poland.

The initial step towards further reform was naturally bound to consist in the introduction of a uniform currency in a country where three sorts of money were current: German marks in the former Prussian part, Polish marks introduced in former Russian Poland during the German occupation, and Austrian kronen in Galicia and the part of Russian Poland occupied from 1915 to 1918 by the Austrians. Polish marks were put in place of all the foreign currencies as early as 1919. In the same year another task was attacked: the customs tariffs, very different under the three foreign Governments, were replaced by one uniform tariff, chiefly modelled on the Russian tariff. Customs service and procedure were unified at the same time.

Next came the work of imposing new taxes all over the country, instead of the various old ones. In 1920 the Diet voted a uniform income tax and a uniform real property tax. The former was a novelty for what had been Russian Poland; its elaborate system was based on the Austrian model. In consequence of the depreciation of Polish currency, the amount of this tax had to be altered in 1922, salaried and wage-earning professions (officials, clerks, workmen) being taxed less heavily.

The real property tax, which had already begun to be levied under the new Bill, had to be dropped in view of difficulties about fixing its amount; besides, the depreciation of currency made another and very drastic measure necessary: on 16 December, 1921, a tax, to be levied once only, was voted both for property and income, the project being modelled on the *einmalige Vermögens-Abgabe* in Germany in 1913 (though that had served a very different purpose). It diminished the circulation of paper money by 80 milliards at once, and arrested for a time the fall of the Polish mark.

In 1920 the Diet voted a tax on inheritance. In 1922 a new tax on profits (in trade, industry, and the liberal professions) began to be levied; in this case, a former Russian tax—the so-called “patent duty”—served as model, because it was easy of assessment, and this was important, the new Polish financial authorities not possessing sufficient experience to deal with more complex tasks. In the same year a uniform stamp duty was imposed (which had been quite unknown, for instance, in Prussian Poland).

Of direct taxes, two only have remained unregulated so far, viz., those on land and on houses. The second requires great caution in its detail, because of the very different burden of taxation existing in this respect in the three parts of Poland before the war, and also because of the “Lodgers’ and Tenants’ Protection Bill,” which, necessary as it was on account of critical housing conditions, has rendered the income of house-owners quite fictitious. Resolute dealing with the land-tax problem, again, is held up by the great political power of the prosperous Polish peasantry.

Of indirect taxes, the tax on wine was made uniform in 1921, on the Prussian model: but it has no great significance. More important are the taxes on spirits, on sugar, and on matches, all of which were fixed on the same occasion. In 1922 the Diet took up the problem of taxing tobacco: there had been a tobacco monopoly in Austria only. After a sharp parliamentary contest

—caused by the existence of flourishing tobacco industries in Prussian Poland—the tobacco monopoly was extended over the whole Republic.

In view of considerable differences both in amount of taxation and in organisation, a separate financial administration has been maintained until now in former Prussian Poland.

The year 1922, however, is chiefly memorable for the definite step towards financial unification and settlement which was taken by the Finance Minister, Dr. Michalski, in submitting to the Constituent Assembly for the first time an elaborate and orderly Budget for the whole Polish State.

4. *Other domains of legal life.*—It has been thought necessary to deal in somewhat greater detail here with the three departments of political administration, military organisation, and finance, since these most vitally required early settlement, and accordingly have actually been carried nearest to complete unification for the whole of Poland. That does not mean, however, that in other departments there has not been much done in the same direction. For the most part it is possible to let the old foreign order remain in force yet a while, without great danger to the unity of the State, both in the domain of administrative law and of jurisdiction. It is scarcely necessary to enumerate in detail all the laws in question. That work in this field too is very much alive, is sufficiently attested by the *Legal Gazette*, which contained 523 laws, orders, and regulations in 1919, while in 1920 the number rose to 800. In 1921, many important matters having by that time been settled, it fell again to 797, and in 1922 further to 645.

Unification has been completely achieved in the department of the postal, telegraph, and telephone service; the post office savings bank, organised on the Austrian model, has extended its operations (chiefly as a financial clearing institution) over the whole Republic, and it works admirably. Its cheque deposits amounted on 1 July, 1922, to 19 milliards of marks, savings to 4½ milliards, its total assets being represented by the figure of 28 milliards. In the matter of railway transport, unification has been achieved, as far as relations with the outside world are concerned—a uniform tariff being in force throughout the country. In domestic railway tariff policy, local differences still exist, owing to the long-standing habits of the *personnel*, but steps have already been taken to secure unity here as well.

Education has also in a large measure been uniformly organised in all three parts of the country. The higher schools

of university standing are all ruled by a law of 1920, under which they have the right of framing statutes of their own, with due regard for local peculiarities. To the only two Polish universities which existed before the war—those of Cracow and Lwów in Austrian Poland—State Universities in Warsaw, Poznań, and Vilna, as well as a private Roman Catholic university in Lublin, have been added. Besides the Polytechnic High School of Lwów there is now a second in Warsaw: and Cracow (the future centre of a large coal-mining basin) now possesses a High School of Mining, which was planned before the war.

Considerable difficulty was, of course, experienced in finding professors and lecturers to man all these new academies: part of them were taken from among the staff of the old ones, others from among Polish scholars and scientists holding chairs in foreign Universities (chiefly Russian), or not occupying any chairs at all (as was often the case in Warsaw before the war, the Polish University there having been Russianised in 1867).

For secondary schools four new types were established, besides technical schools of secondary grade.

The introduction of a new all-Poland type of elementary school is hampered very much by the lack of qualified teachers. In Russian Poland, in particular, illiteracy had been rampant because of the intentional neglect of education by the Russian Government; and Prussian Poland, again, had been flooded by those leading agents of Germanism—the German schoolmasters, who have now returned to their own country, and have had to be replaced by Poles at a moment's warning. It is easy to imagine that Austrian Poland, with its supply of teachers just sufficient for its own needs before the war, and also considerably thinned by the war, has not been able to fill the breach at once for the whole remainder of Poland, and lack of teachers is still badly felt.

Labour legislation in Poland has borne fruit in the shape of a number of uniform laws for the whole State. As early as 1918 a Bill was passed establishing the eight hours' day, and in 1920 a law making sickness insurance universal and compulsory.

A law on waterways and water-rights, which was an entire novelty for the former Russian Poland, is in operation throughout the Republic, and so is one on electricity. Bills dealing with various aspects of industrial organisation are in preparation and will occupy the new Polish Parliament.

Less has been accomplished so far in the matter of unification of the administration of law, and of the uniformity of law itself. Here the Polish State finds in operation elaborate codes, to

which both the judges and the judged have been accustomed for long past, and the preparation of new codes must take much time. Accordingly, law has remained so far more or less untouched. Separate supreme judicial bodies have been formed for former Austrian and Prussian Poland within the Supreme Court in Warsaw. The regulations regarding administrative jurisdiction had to be left as they were for a time, the differences being more striking here than elsewhere; Austria had only one administrative tribunal (*Verwaltungs-Gerichtshof*) for the whole of the State; in Prussia administrative jurisdiction had three graduated instances; in Russia it was unknown altogether.

Thus Poland at the present moment is still governed by different codes of civil, commercial, and criminal law in its three parts, and by different systems of legal procedure. But the work of unification is proceeding here as elsewhere. A Codifying Commission was formed in 1919; it has already put before the Diet two projects: one of international private law for Poland, and one of private law as between the three parts of the country. Besides, it has almost finished a uniform statute of organisation for Poland's courts of law and legal procedure, a code of commercial law, and one of law of bills of exchange, also a law for the protection of literary property. A code of criminal law—for reasons of principle, the hardest of all to draw up—is making good progress. Work on the code of civil law is still delayed by the problem of marriage law: in Prussia civil marriage before a State Registrar was compulsory; in Austria admissible in rare cases; in Russia only marriages in church were allowed. Again, jurisdiction in marriage matters belonged to State Courts in Austria and Prussia, to Ecclesiastical Courts in Russia. The difficulty is further increased by the necessity of first concluding a Concordat with the Vatican, such as shall determine the position of the Roman Catholic Church in Poland. Another department of civil law which will require protracted and careful work concerns the rights of labour.

These are the main reasons why Poland does not yet possess a uniform code of civil law, and will have to wait for it some time longer.

III.—GENERAL REMARKS.

The above account of the work done in Poland for the unification of the State naturally deals with the subject in broad outline only, and it is concerned with two problems exclusively, *viz.*, with economic reconstruction and political organisation.

These themes, of course, do not exhaust Polish energy since 1918; large domains of it have been left unnoticed, such as that of international relations, which fairly swarms with treaties and conventions, political and commercial, concluded by the new Polish State; or that of actual economic initiative by way of private enterprise in industry and trade: there were 135 new joint stock companies formed in 1920, and 236 in 1921; finally, there is the whole enormous amount of energy devoted to land reform since the passing of the Land Reform Bill in 1918.

It would seem, however, that even the limited sketch presented here, and supported by a handful of figures, may sufficiently convince every unprejudiced person that work is being done in Poland, and done earnestly. Those who say otherwise—such as the late Italian Prime Minister, Nitti, in his book *Europa senza Pace*—evidently have not taken the trouble to make themselves acquainted with what is going on in Poland. They have based their opinion on the allegations of persons unfriendly to Poland, and they express it all the more forcibly because they are unable to substantiate their assertions by evidence.

It must be frankly owned that the wholesale work which had to be done could not always be minutely accurate, that blunders were committed, that much remains unsettled which irritates Poles even more than foreigners. Criticism, and very trenchant criticism, of present conditions is not lacking in Poland itself; its mainspring is an ardent desire to make the working, both of the State and of society, as efficient as possible; but this does not mean that what has been achieved should pass unrecognised. If productiveness of work has diminished (as it has in other countries) in one social sphere—in the mines and factories—activity is on the other hand greater than ever in commerce, output is greater than ever in agriculture, exertion is more intense than ever in the intellectual work of the educated class who shape the new State. Defects still extant and undeniable in the working of the State itself are accounted for by the extraordinarily difficult conditions under which that work had to be begun, and is still being conducted, and also by a deficiency of qualified individuals for the different tasks. Officials, teachers, judges, had to be found for the whole of Poland, while Galicia alone had been producing them before the war. Galicians did not know the conditions in other parts of Poland well enough, and workers from these other parts themselves had to be used, such as they were—insufficiently prepared for the most part—because there were no others; but there have been serious attempts to remedy

these unavoidable defects by removing the unfit; a great reduction of the official *personnel* was carried out in 1922, and time, by giving opportunity to the new workers to gain experience, will increase their efficiency. Nobody at any rate will deny that, given the conditions, nothing else was to be expected.

Progress in the new work there is, undoubtedly, and it is most certainly not slow, but quick. This gives us hope that the Poles will succeed finally in grappling with the hard tasks which they have taken in hand. We may boldly put to our critics the question whether another nation, building up a State under such uncommonly difficult circumstances, in a country so terribly devastated, and with such a lack of qualified workers, could have done better in the same time.

STANISLAS KUTRZEBA.

SLAVONIC STUDIES IN FRANCE

It has taken a long time for Slavonic studies to gain a full place in French University education, and even after winning it they long remained for purely "classical" scholars a strange form of learning, a perverse aberration rather than a real science. "Can one be a Persian?" was the question asked by contemporaries of Montesquieu. But in the XIXth century, both in the domain of scholarship and of instruction, it long seemed less strange to busy oneself with Persian than with Russian, Czech or Magyar.

The priority given to the Asiatic East may be explained by traditional economic and political connections and by the part which the East played in French policy. We needed a staff to represent us and serve our interests in those regions. It was Colbert who founded, under the name of *Ecole des jeunes de langue*, the now famous institution known as the *Ecole des Langues orientales vivantes*. Russian had no place at all in that scheme, and it was only half a century later, when Peter the Great visited France, that France began to discover Russia; it only forced an entry at a very late date, and till two years ago it was the only representative of the Slavonic family. If the importance attached to the study of German since 1870 and the swing-over to English since 1914 did not already provide striking proof of the influence of politics upon the study of foreign languages, we might find in this more remote and modest domain, absolutely convincing evidence. It was owing to a kind of political interest, sentimental rather than opportunist, that the first Chair of Slavonic studies was endowed in France, when in 1840 at the Collège de France Adam Mickiewicz was invited to give a course of Slavonic literature and language (note the singular; it says volumes for the knowledge of the period). Mickiewicz was succeeded by Cyprien Robert and Chodzko and since 1885 M. Louis Leger, the Nestor of French Slavists, has continued the work with all his old-time enthusiasm and zeal. Direct political interests are more noticeable in the creation of the first Chair of Russian, which was founded in 1875 at the School of Oriental Languages. M. Leger, who received the appointment, has described with his customary verve the anxieties caused

three years earlier to Thiers by the idea that Pan-Slavism might be taught at Paris. Poor Pan-Slavism! how many mistakes have to this very day been committed in its name!—and not always unwittingly. In Thiers there was a curious blend of ignorance, prejudice and perhaps even a prophetic consciousness that the two great neighbours of Imperial Germany would need to join forces to resist her, and that mutual knowledge must precede alliance.

Since 1875, then, Paris has had two official centres of Slavonic teaching; but twenty years passed before a third was added in the provinces. The city of Lille and the Department of the North took the initiative, and appointed as Professor of Russian M. Haumant, who in 1902 became the first holder of a similar Chair of Russian Language and Literature founded in the University of Paris. Gradually official or private Russian classes began to be formed in various provincial universities. Finally, as a result of the war, a Chair of Russian was founded at Lyon University; then one for Slavonic languages at Strasbourg; and these were speedily followed by the provision of teaching in Czech, Serbo-Croat and Polish at the School of Oriental Languages, and a Chair of Slavonic History and Civilisation at the University of Paris.

The following is a list of the posts existing in France to-day for the exclusive study of Slavonic subjects:—

I. Paris.—(1) Chair of Languages and Literatures of Slavonic Origin at the Collège de France—held by M. Louis Leger, who deals alternately with the grammar of the different Slavonic languages and with the literary history of the Slavonic peoples; (2) Chair of Russian Language and Literature in the Arts Faculty of the University—held by M. Haumant, who conducts practical language teaching and studies the history of Russian civilisation; (3) Chair of Russian at the School of Living Oriental Languages, where M. Boyer gives a course on Russian which has won for him the affection and admiration of a now numerous body of students; (4) (5) (6) Chairs of Polish, Serbo-Croat and Czech—all three at the School of Oriental Languages—which are now entering their third year of existence; (7) the Ernest Denis Chair of History and Civilisation of the Slavs, in the Arts Faculty, founded by the Czechoslovak Government in order to honour by a permanent record of gratitude the memory of a man whose deep knowledge, lofty ideals and generous heart rendered such incomparable services to the nation of Hus. This Chair was established in December 1921, with a title which clearly defines

its sphere, and is filled by the present writer; (8) The Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu Chair of the Ethnography of the Peoples of Central and Eastern Europe, at the École Libre des Sciences Politiques¹—held by M. René Henry. The title of this Chair shows that it is almost exclusively devoted to a study of the Slavonic peoples; (9) Lectureships attached to the Russian Chair in the Arts Faculty and to each of the Chairs of the School of Languages.²

II. University of Lille.—Chair of Russian Language and Literature, held by M. Lirondelle, a specialist on contemporary Russian literature.

III. University of Lyon.—Chair of Russian Language and Literature, held by M. Patouillet, Director of the French Institute of Petrograd.

IV. University of Strasbourg.—Chair of Slavonic Language and Literature, held by M. André Mazon, author of the *Lexique de la Guerre et de la Révolution en Russie* and of the Czech Grammar that recently appeared in the *Collection de Grammaires* of the Institute of Slavonic Studies. M. Mazon is assisted by lecturers in Russian and in Czech.

V. University of Clermont-Ferrand.—Lectures on Russian.

There are also the following chairs or courses not specially concerned with Slavonic studies, but in which the latter have a more or less important place :—

I. Paris.—Collège de France.—Chair of Comparative Grammar—held by M. Meillet, the distinguished philologist, who gives every two or three years a course of Slav linguistics; (2) The University—Chair of Byzantine History, held by M. Diehl; (3) École pratique des hautes Études (section of philological and historical science), course on comparative grammar, by M. Meillet, who deals with the Slavonic languages in the same way as at the Collège de France; (4) Ibidem (department of religious science), lectures on Byzantine Christianity and Christian

¹ This school, which was founded after 1870 by M. Boutmy and his friends and has rendered great services to French thought, is on the borderline of official education, and may be called the University of France in the Napoleonic sense of the word.

² The title of "*lecteur*" in France is reserved for teachers of foreign nationality who, under the direction of the professor, give practical linguistic instruction. At the *Ecole des Langues* the *lecteurs* bear the title of *répétiteurs*. To this category belongs the course of Bulgarian given for the last two years by a Bulgarian professor at the School of Oriental Languages. This is certainly the embryo of a future Chair, whose foundation must, however, depend upon financial and perhaps even political circumstances. Such courses are free of charge and subject to an authorisation renewed year by year.

Archæology, by M. Gabriel Millet, the well-known historian of Serbian religious art.

II. University of Dijon. A Chair of Foreign Literature, held by M. Jules Legras, the author of *En Sibérie* and the recent and important *Mémoires de Russie*. In his lectures M. Legras often deals with questions of Russian literature and civilisation, and also gives every year a free course on Russian language.

In this connection mention should be made of the Chairs of foreign literature or of history and geography at our different universities, since courses are frequently devoted to Slavonic questions. Indeed, such men as Alfred Rambaud and Ernest Denis, who were long the only authorities in France on the history of the Slavonic peoples, as studied direct from the original sources, could only treat these subjects in so far as a general Chair of Modern Contemporary History left them time from their other duties. But, on the one hand, the share assigned to Slavonic questions in these Chairs of literature or history is to-day too limited and too uncertain to allow of their being definitely counted in our domain; and, on the other hand, the increase of strictly Slavonic courses already tends to restrict the rôle played by these "intermittent" subjects of instruction.

There are also two special institutions in Paris which, though somewhat on the borderline and in one case only temporary, cannot fairly be omitted even from this rapid survey. The first is made up of two free establishments, differing slightly in type but inspired by the same ideals: the Collège libre des Sciences sociales and the École des hautes Études sociales, both of which, while open to the public at large, do not exclude students and specialists, and which definitely aim at popularising (but according to scientific methods) questions of topical interest and of practical application. Both devote considerable space, at fairly regular intervals, to Slavonic studies, which are dealt with by French or foreign specialists, always competent and often of real authority.

The second group, which is more recent and at the same time highly interesting, consists of the Russian Higher Schools, which the generosity of the French Government has allowed to be linked up with the Faculties of the University of Paris, in order to provide exiled Russian professors with the means of teaching and study, and also of livelihood, and to enable Russian students to pursue their studies without losing all touch with the intellectual currents of their own country. At first limited to some essential lectures on law, this institution has spread and will

in the present term take a large place in the Faculties of Law, Sciences and Arts. These lectures are delivered in Russian and are accessible to French students who are masters of that language—and of these there is already a considerable number. But all those of our Russian colleagues who are able to do so give some of their instruction in French, and thus the circle of possibilities for Slavonic studies in France is ever growing.

In his very interesting article on Russian studies in England Sir Bernard Pares emphasised the distinction between purely linguistic or philological studies and "nation-study." The structure of our higher education perhaps makes it somewhat more difficult for our own Universities than for those of Britain to find room for studies which have practical ends in view; with us such studies are mainly provided for in the commercial high schools, of which we have a fair number of different types. However, the Universities are not out of touch with this tendency, nor are their doors closed to those who have not passed through a classical training and who do not aspire to the diplomas that open the way to official life. In particular, the School of Oriental Languages, which aims very definitely at producing not only officials but also the commercial and business men of the future, is friendly to such workers. For some ten or fifteen years past, but especially since the war, there has been a movement of interpenetration between science and practice; commerce and industry have made a special appeal to a large number of young men or women who have passed through higher studies, and many brilliant students preparing for the public service have been diverted into active and lucrative professions; and if this tendency continues, the mixed character of Slavonic studies will become still more marked. Recent political changes in Europe and those which the near future almost certainly has in store for us, impart a burning interest to Slavonic questions all along the line. In the past it was especially young officers both in Paris and in the provinces who bulked largely at lectures on Russian; and an enquiry into the knowledge of Russian in military circles might produce surprising results. The war and its consequences have likewise given an impetus to the study of the languages and conditions of the new Slavonic states, and the new courses arranged at the School of Oriental Languages have been attended by many persons eager for travel and adventure or led by business motives and scientific interest.

There is hardly any country where the question of "sanctions," *i.e.*, of the diplomas that are the reward of academic

studies, does not play a big part in the life of the students, and determine in a large measure the force of attraction of those studies. For a long time in France the only diploma open to students of Slavonic subjects was that of the School of Oriental Languages, which may be obtained at the end of three years' close study; and Russian, being the only language taught there, was the only language for which it could be granted. To-day it may be gained for Polish, Czechoslovak and Serbo-Croat also. But for some fifteen years past the increasing prominence given to Slavonic languages at the University, and the efforts made to ensure them the status of an optional subject in secondary education, have brought about the creation of university diplomas in Russian, modelled on those hitherto granted only to students of the Germanic or Southern languages. To-day, the degree of *licencié* in Russian can be granted by any Faculty of Arts which provides teaching in that language, and confers the same rights as "*licences*" in other subjects, notably that of entering for the doctorate. The four certificates of which it is composed relate to—(1) classical literary studies (French and Latin or Greek); (2) Russian literature (composition in Russian on a subject from Russian literature, explanation of Russian in French, questions on literary history); (3) philology (written translation from French into Russian, questions on grammar and on the history of the language); (4) practical studies (written translation from Russian into French, conversation on Russian civilisation, based on the works that the candidate is expected to have read and on his personal observations; questions on another living language). One, two or three of these certificates may be combined with certificates of another group, to form a *licence ès lettres* which, while not qualifying for a teaching post, confers upon the holder all the other advantages attached to this title. We may then have such a group as Russian literature, Russian philology, German literature and modern comparative literature; or practical Russian, English, contemporary history and general geography; or again, Russian philology, general linguistics, comparative grammar of the Slavonic languages and phonetics, or other similar variations. The elasticity of this degree thus corresponds to the diversity of objects aimed at by Slavonic studies in our universities. The *licence* in Russian or the *licence ès lettres*, a combination of which comprises one or more of the certificates in Russian, gives the right of competing for the two doctorates that come under our degree organisation; viz., the *doctorat d'Université mention lettres*, and the *doctorat ès*

lettres (d'Etat). The first involves an examination and also the preparation and defence (*soutenance*) of a printed thesis; the second, which involves two theses, is a necessary qualification for higher teaching posts, and from the thesis of M. Leger on the *Chronique de Nestor* up to those, some of very recent date, of M. Patouillet on the *Théâtre de Mœurs russe*, of M. Mazon on *Ivan Goncharov*, and on the *Aspects du Verbe russe*, of M. Duchesne on the *Stoglav*, and of M. Réau on *Falconet*, not forgetting M. Ernest Denis's *Jean Hus*, it has given rise in the sphere of Slavonic studies to a certain number of works, some of which are of the very first class. The new importance of Slavonic studies can only increase this movement, and already a certain number of young scholars have entered their names for theses on the history of Polish, Czechoslovak or Yugoslav literature or civilisation. Those French or foreign workers who are debarred by age, previous studies or lack of time from the university honours courses, and who, nevertheless, are, for sentimental or practical reasons, anxious to possess official attestation of their work and knowledge, may gain at all our universities a diploma of higher studies, and at some of the universities a certificate, "brevet" or diploma of Russian or Slavonic studies. The diploma of higher studies, which is a doctorate in miniature and without the name (though the essays for which it is granted are indisputably as good as, and often better than, the university "dissertations" of German type), is required of *licenciés* competing for the degree of *agrégé* (a competitive examination which qualifies for the professorial title in secondary education), and may be obtained without any previous degree. The test comprises a manuscript essay and its discussion, explanations of authors, and questions for brief treatment. This year, for the first time, there has been laid before the board of the Faculty of Arts of Paris an essay on the history of Bohemia, largely based on Czech sources and texts. As regards special diplomas, or *brevets*, they will naturally tend to be set aside in favour of certificates for the degree of *licencié*, which comprises a wider and deeper programme of studies.

A recent decree has introduced into our universities an innovation which agrees with an idea long ago expressed by the great philosopher, Emile Boutroux, and will, perhaps, be the first step to a thorough-going modification of the traditional framework as constituted in the Middle Ages by the Faculties. It is the decree of 1920, which authorises the establishment, within the universities, of institutes, some of which are attached to a given Faculty, while others overlap and, though attached *pro forma* to

one or other Faculty, are really more dependent upon the university as a whole. Each of these institutes groups together the whole of the studies concerned with a certain discipline, whether concentrated in one Faculty or divided among several. The value of this reform lies not only in the lowering or breaking down of the barriers which, under the old system, kept sister subjects so entirely apart: for instance, literature and history had nothing to do with each other from the point of view of administration, and consequently of the university. It also substitutes for the watertight compartment system free communication and collaboration, allowing a number of ancient and modern studies to pass from the field of pure philology to that of "nation-study," resting on a study of the language as its base, but with philology as one only of its possible goals. Slavonic studies will be able, according to circumstances, either to form a separate institute or enter into the Institute of Foreign Languages and Literatures. This new form of university activity has as yet only been applied at Strasbourg, and on a greater scale in Paris. The Institute of Slavonic Studies in Paris was in date the first of the institutes of the Faculty of Letters, and still is the most individualist and the most original in its structure, as also the widest and most independent in its conception.

The name and the deed have here, as often, preceded the law. There existed, even before 1914, an Institute of Slavonic Studies at the Faculty of Arts of Paris, housed on the third floor of the Sorbonne, with a fairly large lecture room and a professor's room. These quarters were satisfactory in themselves, and only seem inadequate if we compare them with those allotted to other branches, or if we bear in mind what has since been accomplished. Good work was done in this, the first cell in our Slavonic hive. Here were composed, under the direction of MM. Denis and Haumant, a number of essays of great value, which, it is to be hoped, will one day see the light. Moreover, it was here that students and colleagues before and during the war frequently profited by the suggestive conversations and inexhaustible but critical kindness of Denis. Convinced as he was from the very outset that Austria-Hungary would crumble through total failure to understand its historic mission, and that the Slavs would win their freedom, he also thought he was now certain to realise the dearest hope of his literary career, namely the creation in Paris of a powerful and vigorous centre of Slavonic studies. This idea he followed out in courses of Slavonic lectures at the Sorbonne during the winters of 1915-16 and 1916-17 (afterwards

interrupted by the tragic events in Russia), and by the publication of *Le Monde Slave*, which appeared from July 1917 to June 1918, and came to an end for the same reason. Encouraged in his plans and helped in their realisation by Professor Masaryk, Dr. Beneš, and Mr. Vesnić, he did not allow his certainty to be shaken, even when ultimate victory seemed most distant and most improbable, and kept before his eyes the vision of the palace which the liberated Slavs in their gratitude to France were to raise with his help to Slavonic studies in Paris. When victory came, the Institute was rapidly organised and formally opened in November 1919, in a house next door to that of M. Denis himself.

The originality of this creation consists in its dual character. The Institute of Slavonic Studies is not a mere official establishment. It owes its birth to and remains the property of a free association of subscribers, who control it from the material point of view by a directing board elected annually at the General Assembly and by the staff elected by the Council itself. But as regards its scientific activity, it is closely connected with French academic life :—first of all by its statutes, which prescribe that only professors of the higher education of Paris may occupy the two most important positions, namely, those of president and secretary-general, and secondly by the intentions of its founder, whose spirit will never cease to animate it. M. Denis had faith in the future of democracy, if only it could steer clear of demagoguery, but its first duty was, in his opinion, to qualify by education for its great mission.¹ He was eager that the Institute should play a great part as the intermediary in thought and heart between France and the Slavonic nations. Popularisation on sound lines was to him an indispensable part of his work, but this could only rest on accurate and scholarly work, shown either in minute and detailed investigation or in such a synthesis of labour as his own model works on the history of Bohemia. He loved to repeat that France is a democracy guided by an intellectual *élite*; that to convince the democracy it was necessary to convince the *élite*; and that the *élite* could be convinced only by solid scientific work. The ivory tower was not the aim of M. Denis. All his life he had been active, and in its last phase, that of the war, he was feverishly active. His Institute was to be devoted to the double passion which filled him to the end—namely, science and action through science.

¹ His views on this point are clearly expressed in the preface to *La Grande Serbie*, which is the manifesto of the "Bibliothèque d'Histoire et de Politique," founded and edited by him.

He was struck, as we all are, by the scientific riches of France, and at the same time by the dispersion and isolation of effort which prevents these riches from bearing full fruit. The free framework of an institute seemed to him the best means of grouping together all these forces, the addition of which means their multiplication. Thus conceived and organised, the Institute of Slavonic Studies was to be the meeting-place of French Slavists, both those of the provinces and those of Paris: and indeed all holders of Slavonic posts are members of its directing board. The Institute does not itself give instruction, but it co-ordinates the different centres of instruction scattered among the various higher schools, by offering the professors natural and regular opportunities for meeting and for following in concert the work of their students; it puts lecture rooms at the disposal of those instructors who find it more convenient to give their lessons in the Institute; it has built up the nucleus of a scientific Slavonic Library. It organises, moreover, when suitable occasions offer, lectures on Slavonic subjects; it provides Slavonic students with a reading room where the different journals and reviews are laid out, and with an opportunity for gatherings. In this way the Slavonic students are helped over any home sickness and loneliness, and the French students have an opportunity for pleasant and fruitful meetings with their Slavonic comrades.

M. Denis only lived to see the first promise of that success which before our own eyes is developing more rapidly than we had ever dared to hope. The *Slavonic Review* has praised our *Revue des Études slaves* and our Polish and Czech grammars in a fashion which frees us from the embarrassment of having to speak of them. The *Histoire de l'Art russe*, by M. Réau, appeared under the auspices of the Institute. Other grammars and historical works are being completed at this moment. The French Government has shown its confidence in the Institute by entrusting it with the organisation in Paris of higher Russian teaching and of assistance to Russian refugee students in France. It has also handed over to it the care of choosing and guiding the young scholars or students who intend to make a prolonged stay in Slavonic countries, and so equip themselves for ensuring the future of Slavonic studies in France. Its legal statutes have been fixed by a convention with the University of Paris, and its future has been assured by the gratitude of the Czechoslovak Republic towards the Frenchman who has earned a place among its founders.

In September, 1921, the Czechoslovak Parliament established the "Fondation Ernest Denis," amounting to a million francs—one half for the endowment of the Ernest Denis Chair at the University of Paris, the other half for the purchase, enlargement and maintenance of the twin houses in the Rue Michelet, one of which was the dwelling of Ernest Denis and the other the cradle of the Institute. Thus the latter had its own private fortune when, taking advantage of the generous terms of the decree of 1920, it became affiliated in 1921 to the University of Paris. This connection in no way jeopardises its own constitution nor its administrative autonomy, and does not in any way endanger its moral independence; it merely gives a more satisfactory legal form to collaboration with the University, and also ensures more efficient working. Till this convention was signed, the schemes which M. Denis had at heart really depended on a kind of "personal union."

Such is at the present moment the organisation of Slavonic studies in France. If one compares the list of our teaching centres and of our institutes with the long columns filled in enumerating the corresponding ones at German Universities, it seems so modest that some of us are often tempted to blush at its poverty. M. Denis often repeated that time is required for carrying out its work; and if we compare the present condition of Slavonic studies with that of ten, or even three, years ago, we are no longer struck by the modesty, but rather the surprising rapidity, of development. No one is more conscious than we ourselves of the gaps that must still be made good. But the ardour of the pioneers of this great work, the enthusiasm of the new generation, the ever-increasing respect paid to scholarship by the French nation, and the new position of affairs in Europe after a war which has changed the face of the Slavonic world—all this, if it does not justify immoderate ambitions, does at least enable us to regard the present organisation of Slavonic studies in France as a sure guarantee of the future.

LOUIS EISENMANN.

TRANSYLVANIA. (I.)

OF the many radical political changes wrought by the Great War in Eastern Europe, the two most important are the restoration of Polish independence and the creation of a compact Roumanian State of nearly 17 million inhabitants, comprising all but an insignificant minority of the Roumanian race. Roumanian unity rests above all upon the transference of Transylvania and the greater part of seven counties of Hungary proper, from the Holy Crown of St. Stephen to the Kingdom of Roumania (itself formed out of the union of the two principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia in a single state). The boundaries of the new state thus coincide fairly exactly with those of the ancient Roman province of Dacia, organised by Trajan in 107 A.D., on the ruins of the powerful barbarian kingdom of Decebalus. The modern Roumanians claim descent from the colonists of Trajan and look upon Transylvania as the cradle of their race, while the Magyars have challenged the doctrine of historic continuity and affect to regard them as newcomers, not only in Transylvania, but even in Wallachia. The question of Roumanian origins¹ has thus unhappily long ceased to be one of academic research, and has been envenomed by national passions and propagandist motives. Some of the protagonists are inspired by the futile and anachronous theory *prior tempore, potior iure*—it being seriously argued that those whose ancestors can be proved to have been the firstcomers are entitled to restrict the political rights of later arrivals. This explains the eagerness of the Magyar to prove the Roumanian to be a XIIIth century immigrant, while, on a similar basis, the latter's Roman ancestry would give him a clear precedence of eight centuries over his rival.

Geography has given to Transylvania a distinct character and identity of its own, which makes it stand out boldly from any physical map of Europe. On the south and east its boundaries are the summits of the great Carpathian chain; on the north it ceases where the river Someş (Szamos) prepares to

NOTE.—So far as possible, I have designedly confined my references to works accessible to Western students.

(¹) See my article in the forthcoming number of *History*.

enter the great plain on its way to join the Tisza; on the west another high mountain barrier separates it from the central Hungarian plain. Inside these limits Transylvania is an undulating country, fertile, well-watered, well supplied with mineral resources and full of natural beauty. Its very name is in some sense a programme; for "the Land beyond the Forest" implies or assumes that association with the lands lying to the west of it, which has lasted right on to the XXth century. It is, indeed, the projection of some medieval *Drang nach Osten*.

One further point which can never be emphasised too strongly in connection with the early history of all this region, is the almost complete absence of early records. The Roumanians are the only race in Europe of whom it can be said that impenetrable mystery hangs about them from the third to the thirteenth century, and this only serves to accentuate the marvel of their survival as the sentinel of Latin culture and traditions on the Lower Danube and in the Carpathians. But it is to be noted that if the first direct documentary evidence as to the presence of Roumanians in Transylvania dates from 1222 and the first indirect evidence from the year 1197¹, on the other hand the earliest document dealing with Transylvania at all is of 1165, and in the standard collection of Transylvanian charters there are only six altogether before 1200.² Very little at all is known of Transylvania till that date, and it is quite uncertain whether the Székels, that branch of Magyars which inhabits the south-east corner of the country in a compact mass, are descendants of Attila and his Huns, and found their way there independently of the main Magyar immigration into Hungary—this is the view which they themselves take—or whether, as the most recent Magyar scientists hold, they were planted as colonists on the disturbed Eastern frontier by St. Ladislas and his successors in the early twelfth century. In short, it is distinctly tendentious to stress the lack of historical evidence about the Roumanians. The origin of the Székels, and even the manner in which the Hungarian Kingdom asserted its hold on Transylvania, is equally obscure.³

All that we know is that Transylvania was not definitely united with Hungary till after 1003, when St. Stephen reduced

¹ Hunfalvy, *Die Rumänen und ihre Ansprüche*, p. 83.

² Hegesholmu. See Teutsch und Firnhaber, *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte Siebenbürgens*, No. 5.

³ Bedeus v. Scharberg, *Die Verfassung Siebenbürgens*, p. 13. "None of the three privileged (ständisch) nations can prove their origin in detail." According to Hunfalvy (p. 36) Transylvania was at one time known as Ungria Nigra.

its Prince Gyula to submission, and that for the next two centuries it was a common practice to nominate a prince of the Hungarian reigning family as Duke or Statthalter of Transylvania. The twelfth and last appears to have been the son of Béla IV., in 1260, after which there grew up the office of Voivode, which was at least as much military as administrative.

During the eleventh and twelfth centuries Hungary strengthened her hold upon Transylvania, erected fortresses, such as Torda and Dej, established a bishopric between 1103 and 1113 at the former Alba Julia (Gyulafehérvár),¹ and introduced the religious orders, notably the Cistercians at the famous monastery of Kercz, on the Olt, long since a ruin. By the end of this period a county administration appears to have been established on the same lines as in Hungary proper. But the country is scantily populated, and exposed to inroads from the wild Cuman and Tartar tribes, which inhabit North Moldavia and the steppes beyond; and the policy of successive kings is to attract colonists from the West, who will at once protect the frontier and bring the deserted land under cultivation. This motive stands revealed in the motto selected for the earliest seal granted to the newcomers from Flanders and the Rhine—"ad retinendam Coronam."² The generous promises made to them from the very outset by the Hungarian kings are well illustrated by the great lawsuit brought by the Bishop of Transylvania in 1195 before the Roman Curia against the recently founded Chapter (Propstei) of Hermannstadt,³ which was able to maintain its position as holding direct from the Bishopric of Milcov and (after its destruction in 1336) from the Primatial see of Hungary.

A fresh stage is reached in 1211 when Andrew II. granted by charter to the Teutonic knights under Hermann von Salza the care of the south-eastern border—the Burzenland, as the district round Kronstadt is called. But the far-reaching privileges granted to it inflamed the ambition of the Grand Master, who induced the Pope to take the Burzenland under his direct and exclusive jurisdiction. On this, King Andrew, otherwise deplorably weak, acted promptly enough, and in 1225 drove the knights out of Hungary by force of arms; and it was only then that they

¹ St. Ladislas was also the founder of the Bishoprics of Zagreb and Grosswardein (Nagyvárad or Oradea Mare).

² G. D. Teutsch, *Gesch. der Siebenbürger Sachsen*, I., 12.

³ Præpositura Cibiniensis. (Under it were the two subordinate Chapters of Grosschenk and Leschkirch.) *Magazin für Geschichte und Literatur Siebenbürgens*, III., p. 2. The Chapter of Kronstadt (Burzenland) soon acquired a similar position.

turned to establish the little State which was the germ of modern Prussia.

Obviously what had encouraged Hermann in his enterprise had been the uprising of the Hungarian nobles against the kingly power, and their extraction from him in 1222 of the famous Golden Bull, the Magna Charta of the Hungarian Constitution. Undoubtedly also the straits in which the King found himself in face of the nobles, led him to encourage a new middle-class as a makeweight against them. This and the urgent necessities of frontier defence combine to explain the Charter of 1224 (the "Goldene Freibrief") which he granted to the German immigrants. The name of "Hospites," or Guests, under which the charter refers to them, acquired a special and honourable significance in Hungarian history, serving as a reminder of the freedom and privileges of its bearers; but gradually the name Saxon came into general use, and "Saxones" took the place of "Hospites."

The essence of the Charter is complete self-government for the Saxons under an elected Count, or Comes, who holds direct from the King; the right to elect their own judges and clergy without interference; the limitation of property in land to Saxons only, throughout the territories assigned to them; freedom from all tolls and dues for their merchants in all parts of the kingdom; and of course on the other hand, the military obligations to be fulfilled in peace and war. It contains the remarkable phrase that all the inhabitants of a certain territory which it defines are "One People," and thus prescribes a certain unity to the Saxon nation and their lands—the "Fundus Regius," or Königsboden, which was to retain its corporate existence virtually unimpaired from 1222 to 1868.

This Charter is a decisive event which in a sense stereotypes the future and leads to constitutional development on quite unique lines. There are three distinct groupings, known from 1437 onwards as the three privileged nations—the Magyars, the Székels, and the Saxons.

I. The Magyars organised in seven counties,¹ and administered on exactly the same lines as the counties of Hungary proper. The essential point to bear in mind is, that in mediæval Hungary—*i.e.*, constitutionally speaking, in Hungary till 1848—there was an absolute hard and fast distinction between nobles and people, between *populus* and *plebs*. All political power, local and central, was concentrated in the hands of the *Populus*, which was exempt

¹ Alba, Hunyad, Küküllő, Doboka, Kolozs, Torda and Inner Szolnok.

from taxation, and only liable to certain military obligations while the plebs not only had no political status whatever, but had the privilege of paying all the taxes.

II. The Székelys (Szekler, in German; Siculi in Latin), forming a compact group in the south-east, in the bend of the Carpathians. They were organised in seven,¹ afterwards eight,² seats, or Sedes (Szék)—like the Saxons, under their own Count, holding direct from the King. Where they differed from their Magyar kinsmen of the first group is that the Székels were all noble and therefore exempt from taxation, though the military service to which they were liable was of three different grades.³ Another vital difference, doubtless a survival from the old tribal system, was that they held their land in common, and so avoided the large feudal estates.

III. The Szekels were thus in some ways the most democratic of the three groups. For the third, the Saxons, of whom I have already spoken, were from the first a comparatively small community, narrowly jealous of their privileges, and careful to exclude all newcomers from any share in them. That their fears were not unjustified, is no doubt shown by the fate of Klausenburg which, built as a German town, though not on the Königsboden, was then in the mid-XVth century administered equally by Magyars and Saxons, but already by 1568 had fallen under Magyar control, and in modern times became the chief centre of Magyarisation in its most intolerant form. Meanwhile the Saxon land consisted of nine Stühle (Sedes), the chief being Hermannstadt, and two districts, the Burzenland (with Kronstadt) and the Nösnerland (with Bistritz). The Saxons gave to their new home the name of Siebenbürgen, generally derived from seven castles which they built, but latterly sometimes from the "Sibin Burg," the castle of Sibin, or Sibiu.⁴

Owing to geographical reasons—distance from the centre, bad communications, and a special local character—Transylvania under these three privileged groups steadily developed an autonomous life of its own. In the fourteenth century, though remaining an integral part of the Hungarian crown, it tends more and more to transact local business in its own Diet—something between the Central Parliament (which its delegates continued

¹ Maros, Udvarhely, Sepsi, Kézdi, Orbai, Csík, Gyergyó, then Aranyos. Timon, *Ungarische Verfassungs- und Rechtsgeschichte*, p. 240. Benkö, *Transsilvania*, I., 399.

² Under Stephen V.

³ Primores, equites, pixiderii. See Timon, *op. cit.*, p. 241.

⁴ Cibinium. See Roesler, *Rumänische Studien*, cursim.

to attend) and the County Assemblies, which have always formed the backbone of Hungarian political life, or the National Assemblies, which replaced them among the Szekels and the Saxons.¹

This Diet, or *Congregatio Generalis*, bore the title of "*Universitas Nobilium, Sicularum, Saxonum*,"² and documentary evidence, though fragmentary, records at least ten of its meetings between 1322 and 1526.

This latter date is the turning point of Hungarian history the fatal battle of Mohács which led to the Turkish conquest of Central Hungary, the independence of Transylvania under the native princes, and the accession of the House of Habsburg in such fragments as remained in the west and north. But there are two other dates in the hundred years before the battle which are not sufficiently stressed in the ordinary text-books, but which really provide the clue to the whole subsequent development of Hungary down to the present day, to the Transylvanian problem with which I am especially concerned, and to the relations of the Magyar and Roumanian races. These are the so-called Fraternal Union of 1437 and the Great Peasant Rising of 1514.

It is necessary to note in passing the policy of Imperialist expansion pursued in the XIVth century by the Angevin Kings of Hungary. While extending feudalism at home, they aimed at the subjection of Bosnia, Wallachia and Moldavia, and, if possible, even of Serbia, which was much the strongest of the mediæval south-eastern States. The collapse of the Galician kingdom also encouraged them to extend their rule over the Carpathian borderlands of Maramureş, where documentary evidence reveals a considerable Roumanian population, and where Ruthenian immigrants now begin to appear.³ It is also interesting to note that this is where the very first faint traces of Roumanian literature have been found—some rude translations of the Psalms and Gospels, based on Slav Hussite versions.⁴ Parallel with the political expansion of the House of Anjou went its zealous promotion of Catholicism in the countries subject to Orthodoxy, and now to the growing influence of Islam. Much could be said of Rome's persecuting zeal in Bosnia and Morea,

¹ Under Charles Robert, Ladislas Apor as Voivode united also the offices of Szekel and Saxon Count, aiming at independence, and was only quelled with some difficulty.

² Cf. Matthias, writing to the Transylvanians, describes them as "*membrum huius regni*"—a proof that Transylvania was an integral part of Hungary.

³ This was the first germ of that curious product of the Peace of St. Germain, autonomous "Carpatho-Ruthenia."

⁴ Iorga, *Les Roumains de Transylvanie*, I., p. 125.

and its proselytising zeal throughout the Balkans, and of the intolerance with which the Orthodox Greeks responded to its challenge.

There is no doubt whatever that at this period the Roumanians formed a very important element in Transylvania, which Sigismund, in a letter to the Pope in 1412, describes as a country "promiscuarum gentium et linguarum." That they were still on a footing of equality is shown by such a document as that of 1291, by which Andrew III. conferred "cum universis nobilibus Saxonibus Siculis et Olachis in partibus Transilvaniæ,"¹ or that of a century later (1399) which has a reference to "Universis nobilibus tam Ungaris quam Olachis." The last great captain of mediæval Europe, John Hunyády, whose genius delayed the Turkish conquest of Hungary by two generations, was the son of a Roumanian noble in Transylvania, and he relied very largely on men of his own race for organising the defence of the Southern frontier—especially the valleys lying North of the Iron Gates.² But he was not only a Roumanian by race, he was a Hungarian noble in rank and a Catholic by religion; and he gave fresh impetus to a tendency already noticeable among the Roumanian nobility, to merge with the Magyars. Class interests at this date were far stronger than race instincts, the nobles of both races tended to encroach upon yeoman and peasant rights, and in 1437 there was a formidable peasant rising in Transylvania, in which the Roumanians predominated, but were allied with the Magyar peasantry also, and which was only suppressed with the greatest difficulty. The result was the "Brotherly Union" concluded at Kápolna, between the three nations—Nobles, Saxons and Szekels. Still gasping at the danger barely averted, they pledge themselves to mutual aid, partly against the Turks, but above all against those "nefandissimi rustici," and prescribed the death penalty for those who should fail to fulfil the pledge. At its first renewal (1459) under still more intimate conditions, there occurs the significant phrase "regnum hoc totum Transilvaniense."³ Even under King Matthias, and still more under his weak successors, Transylvania is developing an autonomous position.

We thus see a constitution founded upon an oligarchic basis which it was never to lose. The three privileged nations defend

¹ Teutsch und Firnhaber, *Urkundenbuch*, p. 167.

² Lugoj, Caranşebes, etc.

³ Universitas Hungarorum et Valachorum huius principatus Transilvaniæ. See also Timon, *op. cit.*, p. 736.

themselves against all other aspirants. They are the three "united" or "Recognised" Nations (*Nationes Unitae, Receptae*); the others, including the Roumanians are only *Nationes Toleratae*—in the words of Benkö, the chief Magyar authority on Transylvania in the XVIIIth century,¹ "those who do not possess the right of citizenship and access to the political public honours of the Principality, but are held to be merely tolerated by grace."² We must be careful not to read the racial feuds of to-day back into the annals of the dying Middle Ages, but it is highly significant that a law passed in 1463 lays down that the serfs left behind to defend the home territory during the military operations against the Turks *must be of Magyar blood*.³ It does show that there was already the double barrier of blood and of social privilege. Whatever may have been the situation in the Dark Ages, there is no doubt that from the beginning of the era of fresh colonisation—that is, from the eleventh century onwards—the mass of the population in Transylvania consists more and more of Roumanian stock, held more and more in bondage by masters of alien blood and religion, ruthlessly using the power conferred by feudal land tenure and social distinction.

King Matthias, great as he was, could not check the growing power of the nobles and of the Church, and the consequent further encroachments upon the rights of the peasantry. The change after his death is dramatically expressed in the popular proverb "King Matthias is dead, and with him justice." The Crown rapidly lost all power and prestige; it failed or was unable to maintain the mercenary forces upon which he had relied, and its revenues shrank and almost threatened to dry up. The utter lawlessness of the nobility, often amounting to civil war, brought Hungary to the verge of dissolution long before the final crisis of foreign invasion.

In 1514 these desperate internal conditions caused a new Peasant Rising, this time mainly among the Magyar population. The proclamation of a crusade by Cardinal Bakács provided the excuse, but its leader George Dózsa, a Szekel captain, soon gave it a definitely social character, bitterly hostile to the nobles.⁴ He

¹ Benkö, op. cit., I., p. 472.

² That they were regarded as useful, and indeed indispensable, is shown by a further phrase of Benkö, "*Nec cavere Valachis sine irreparabili damno nobiles Transilvani possent: eorum siquidem servitiis jabbagionalibus utantur potissimum*," *ibid.*, p. 472.

³ Iorga, *Les Roumains de Transylvanie*, I., p. 137. Hurmuzaki, *Documente Privitoare* (Roum. ed.), I., p. 147.

⁴ For seemingly national motives, however, they were joined by the Roumanian lesser nobles, especially in the Maramureş district.

styled himself "head and captain of the dedicated army of the Cross of the Kingdom of Hungary, not subject to the lords," and he fulminated against "the faithless nobles." The name of "Kurucz" which his followers assumed has acquired a permanent meaning in Hungarian history, to denote those who rose in arms against authority. It was borne by the rebels of Rákóczy in the opening XVIIIth century, and by the peasantry under Kossuth in 1848, and is still a name to conjure with among the awakening peasantry of to-day. The movement was marked by horrid excesses and suppressed with still more hideous cruelty. Dózsa was placed by gipsy executioners on a red-hot throne, crowned and torn with pincers, and then some of his starving followers were forced to eat his roasting flesh. Such treatment was too much even for opinion in that age, and a popular legend was current about Zápolya, the suppressor of the rebellion, that for some years after these events he was struck with temporary blindness every time that he presented himself to receive the Host.

But 1514 is the parting of the ways. Suppression is absolutely draconic all along the line. As punishment, the peasantry are expressly deprived for all time of their right of free migration (*Freizügigkeit*) and become tied to the soil. Henceforth no one of peasant birth may become a Bishop. No peasant can bring any suit against a noble. His testimony is worthless in a court of law. If he dies intestate, his property goes to his lord. If he carries arms, he loses his right hand. These and other equally stringent provisions form a vital portion of the new code of law called the *Tripartitum*,¹ passed by the Hungarian Parliament after the rising. This code represents the advent to power of the lesser nobles,² to whom in later times our English word "gentry" is attached, though of course acquiring a special Hungarian flavour of its own. A gulf is fixed between masters and serfs, which is the more marked because there is no middle class (as in England) to bridge the void. For the towns stand apart and live their own life, as Royal free cities, entrenched in their narrow privileges, and for the most part German by race and language, governed in accordance with the Magdeburg municipal code.³ How little political control they exercised over the affairs of the nation, is shown by the fact that right up to 1848

¹ Pars III. Tit. 30, § 8.

² In 1507 they secured a majority in the State Council (16 to 8). Fraknói, *Ungarn vor der Schlacht bei Mohács*, p. 1-10.

³ Pest is called in old documents "*ditissima villa Teutonum*"—Virozsil, *Staatsrecht des Königreichs Ungarn*, II., p. 365.

all the free cities combined, only had the same voting power as one of the 52 counties of Hungary, despite their constantly asserted claim to equal rights.

It was necessary to dwell upon these changes in the condition of the peasantry, because they show why Hungary was incapable of resistance to the Turks. What had enabled Bohemia in the previous century to defy all Europe in arms, was the fact that the nobles had the backing of a free peasantry, of course further inspired by religious enthusiasm. In the Hungary of 1526 the very opposite was the case: the nation was profoundly divided, the masses crushed, resentful and indifferent, the Church corrupt, the Crown a cipher, the nobles at variance among themselves. As we shall see, the peculiar development of the Roumanians in Transylvania cannot be understood without the study of these events.

In 1526 the battle of Mohács led at once to a partition of Hungary, which was to last for 160 years. The Turks overran the great plains of Central Hungary, and in 1541 the fortress of Buda became the advance guard of Islam in Europe—as they themselves called it, “the pivot of the holy war,” ranking tenth among the cities of the Empire.¹ What was left was disputed between rival claimants to the throne; each of the two dominant factors in turn seized the Crown jewels and crowned its candidate. Thus for twelve years, amid the yearly recurring menace of the Turk, John Zápolya and Ferdinand of Habsburg continued the civil war. The days when Hungary was called *propugnaculum Christianitatis* were now forgotten, and in the year that Suleiman besieged Vienna (1529) John Zápolya did homage to the Sultan not far from the field of Mohács, swearing to succour him with all his worldly goods, even though only three or four Moslems were left beside him. The situation was complicated by periodical incursions of Peter Rareș, Prince of Moldavia.

At last in 1538 Ferdinand and Zápolya signed a treaty leaving each in possession of what he actually held. Thus Zápolya retained Transylvania with certain additional counties (including Debreczen and Kaschau), while Ferdinand kept the rest of Slovakia, the districts west and north of Lake Balaton and most of Croatia. Zápolya was to retain the kingly title, but only for his lifetime. It is from this treaty that the separate existence of Transylvania as a state unit is generally, and quite reasonably, considered to date. That Zápolya had little idea of keeping faith, is shown by the fact that he almost immediately married a

¹ Hammer-Purgstall, *Gesch. des Osmanischen Reiches*, VI., p. 476.

daughter of the Polish King and strengthened his ties with the Sultan. He himself died in 1540, only a few months after the birth of his son John Sigismund. Suleiman at once recognised the infant as king, and renewed his efforts against Ferdinand, reducing further fortresses on the north and organising his conquests into regular vilayets, under the centralised control of the Pasha of Buda. It of course suited him very well to have Transylvania half suspended in the air, under the precarious rule of a woman and a child in arms. There was a long struggle between Ferdinand and Isabella for the possession of Transylvania; it centres round the romantic but dubious figure of Cardinal Martinuzzi (really a Croat Friar named Utješenić, but generally known to contemporary history as Frater George). In the end the Turks turned the scale against the Habsburg cause—the Sultan himself, during one of his many campaigns in Hungary, commanding the Estates to return to their allegiance to John Sigismund (1555).

Henceforth, with two short interruptions, Transylvania is ruled by native Princes till the last decade of the seventeenth century. Its position is almost unique in history. For it now owns two parallel allegiances. Habsburg Hungary had to make a stand, as best it might against the Turks with Imperialist aid, and at the same time to defend the constitution against a foreign Court in Vienna; and then as the Reformation spread, to maintain the Reformed doctrines against Catholic and Jesuit reaction. Meanwhile in the East, Transylvania—in certain respects like its neighbours Wallachia and Moldavia—is balanced uneasily between Vienna, Warsaw and Constantinople. In theory it always remains part of the Hungarian Crown, and the Tripartitum is the basis of its publiclaw just as in Habsburg Hungary—supplemented, but not replaced, by the *Approbatæ Constitutiones*, i.e., the laws passed by the Transylvanian Diet. Thus the Prince takes oath to the King of Hungary, though he is perpetually trying to filch from him further scraps of territory; yet owing his position to Turkish favour, he submits to investiture by the Sultan and pays him an annual tribute. Subject to these two restrictions, there is no interference by the Porte. The Estates are free to elect their Prince; there are only two or three instances of that imposition of a Prince from without which was already the normal practice in the two Roumanian Principalities: and another very vital difference from them is that attempts to extort an increased tribute almost always failed. A good illustration of the dual allegiance is to be found in the action of the Saxons,

who suffered specially from Gabriel Báthory, the only one of the Transylvanian Princes who must be described unreservedly as a bloodthirsty tyrant. In their distress in 1613, they direct simultaneous appeals for help to the Emperor in Prague and to the Sultan in Constantinople.

The princely power develops quite logically out of the old office of Transylvanian Voivode. Already under Matthias the office of Voivode and Count of the Szekels had been united, mainly for military reasons—the Transylvanians forming technically the left wing of the Hungarian Army.¹ When the central power collapsed after Mohács, the Voivode was the real centre of gravity in Transylvania. While constitutional theory remains untouched, from 1542 there is in reality a new constitution due to the stress of circumstances. Till that year the three Nations, though meeting in local Diets, had been represented in the Hungarian Parliament, and all laws passed there held good for Transylvania also. But henceforth the local Diet becomes a real Parliament, being faced with the harsh necessity of levying new taxation. Thus the Union of the three Nations undertakes to share the burdens of defence and administration in equal proportions. An important result of this was that the Szekels lost their freedom from taxation and also the special privileges which rendered them immune from confiscation of land. By 1562 a portion of them were reduced to serfdom, the *Ius Regium* was introduced, and on their territory lands were now often granted on the same sort of tenure as in other Magyar districts.² The hold of the big feudal families on affairs grew stronger, the Prince being invariably selected from their ranks. Of the 23 holders of the princely office—a list from which some might be excluded as doubtful—Michael of Wallachia was the only non-Magyar. Ten belonged to the families of Báthory and Rákóczy; of the others, Zápolya, Apafi and Bocskay, all three now extinct, were among the greatest families of their day, while Kemény and Bethlen are still among the foremost leaders of Magyar oligarchy.

The title which they assumed varied according to the shifting circumstances of the time. John Zápolya had been the lawfully crowned King of Hungary, and his son continued to style himself “*Electus Rex Hungariae*.” Most of their successors bore the title of “*Princeps Transilvaniae et Partium Hungariae*” (that is, of the border counties); but this was expanded by the ambitious if incompetent Sigismund Báthory into the grandilo-

¹ Timon, *op. cit.*, p. 737.

² Marczali, *Ungarische Verfassungsgeschichte*, p. 75.

quent phrase, "Dei Gratiae Regnorum Transilvaniae Moldaviae Valachiae Transalpinæ et Sacri Romani Imperii princeps, Partium Regni Hungariæ Dominus et Siculorum Comes."¹

It is not my present intention to recount the intricate though romantic details of Transylvanian history, but rather to select certain outstanding incidents from the period of the native Princes, and use them as illustrations of the general state of society. Of these the first and most decisive was the coming of the Reformation, which found a specially favourable field in the Saxon Königsboden. This was in the main due to three reasons:—(1) The unusually wide ecclesiastical autonomy enjoyed by the Chapters of Hermannstadt and Kronstadt, and also by Bistritz in the North—all holding direct from Esztergom and exempt from the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Alba Julia; (2) The practice of free election of the priest by the Commune, as one of the privileges conferred under the Diploma Andreanum (the Goldene Freibrief); and (3) the connection with Germany, which resulted in the reformed doctrines spreading rapidly from Leipzig and Wittenberg, through the German merchants, along the Eastern trade routes into the then purely German towns of North Hungary, Zips and Transylvania.² The first two reasons given produced, it is easy to see, a kind of latent conflict with Rome, which would naturally favour the standpoint of the Bishop of Transylvania; and as that See, the only one in the Principality, was always in Magyar hands, this tendency to quarrel was fortified by racial jealousies. In 1516 representatives of all the Saxon "Gäue" united to protest against the encroachments of the Archbishop of Esztergom upon Saxon rights. On the eve of Mohács, King and parliament united in an effort to check the spread of Lutheran doctrines by force. In 1524 a messenger from Wittenberg was burnt in Pest.³ Article IV. of 1525⁴ lays down that "all Lutherans shall be extirpated, and wherever found shall be seized not only by the clergy, but also by the laity, and burnt." But these penalties remained mainly on paper. Many youths went from all Hungary to Wittenberg,⁵ and, so far as the Saxons were concerned, their own Count, Pemfflinger, was himself infected and disregarded the injunctions of the Crown. After Mohács re-

¹ Schuler von Libloy, *Siebenbürgische Rechtsgesch.*, I. 293–8, 307.

² Altsohl, Neusohl, Kremnitz (the mint of Hungary), Leutschau, Kaschau, Klausenburg, Schässburg, Mediasch, Hermannstadt, Kronstadt.

³ Huber, *Geschichte Oesterreichs*, IV., p. 102.

⁴ Between 1523 and 1560, 442 Hungarians matriculated at that University. Huber, *op. cit.*, IV., p. 105.

⁵ *Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche in Ungarn*, p. 53.

pression was impossible, because the machinery for enforcing debateable measures had collapsed, and indeed fallen into three fragments. Zápolya, it is true, threatened the Lutherans with forfeiture of all property, in the hope of winning over the hierarchy:¹ while Ferdinand on his side, in 1527 published an edict deploring the spread of the new doctrines, ordering punishment and confiscation, and promising a third of the forfeit to the informer. But the Reformation now made steady progress in all three sections of Hungary, the more so because it was simultaneously infecting Austria, Styria, and Carniola—and in every case the nobility quite as much as the townsfolk. In Transylvania it found a leader of great mark, who in less narrow surroundings might have acquired the same fame as Zwingli, or Knox, or Beza—Johannes Honterus, who returned to his home in Kronstadt in 1533. He was not only a religious reformer, but a real humanist, with wide mathematical and philosophical learning, admired as a poet, and possessed of a technical knowledge of printing and wood-cutting. He had published a once famous Latin grammar at Cracow, and he brought back with him equipment for a printing press at Kronstadt. With it he published Luther's catechism and the Augsburg Confession, and his influence was tested when, in 1536, the town priest Benkner resigned in impotent anger.² In 1542 Honterus carried the day in Kronstadt. The new priest married, the Mass was abolished, his so-called "Reformationsbüchlein" (comparable to Knox's "Book of Discipline") was published, and the Town Council adopted his school laws. (As in Scotland, reformation and education went hand in hand.) In 1544 Honterus himself succeeded as Town Parson (Stadtpfarrer) of Kronstadt. In the previous year Hermannstadt had also adopted the Reformation, and so in 1545 the two Chapters of Hermannstadt and Kronstadt united with the Saxon clergy of the Transylvanian diocese to form a single "spiritual University."³ Finally, in 1550, unity was given to the new Church by the formal adoption of Honterus's book in the revised form of a "Kirchenordnung aller Deutschen in Siebenbürgen," and the Saxon University prescribed its uniform adoption in all Saxon towns. The result was an exact coincidence of the Saxon Nationality and the Lutheran religion throughout the Königsboden, and practically nothing occurred to disturb normal development.

¹ *Magazin für Geschichte, Literatur, etc., Siebenbürgens*, III. (ed. Trausch), pp. 1-15.

² G. D. Teutsch, op. cit., pp. 212-34.

³ In the medieval sense of the word *universitas*.

Meanwhile Protestantism found a famous Magyar exponent in Matthias Biró, best known as Dévay, also a native of Transylvania. Appointed by the Town Council of Kaschau as Pfarrer in 1531, he was carried off to prison in Vienna and only released owing to high personal influence. After years in Germany he returned to Pest, only to be driven out in 1541 by the Turks. His second exile was spent in Switzerland, and thus his final years at Debreczen gave a more Zwinglian turn to Magyar Protestant development. Protestantism among the Magyars met with more opposition than among the Saxons, developed more slowly and on more confused lines, and was not unaffected by national sentiments. No unity was possible while Ferdinand was straining every effort in his remaining territory to check and suppress heresy, and for a time the Magyar Protestants were more or less divided between the Lutheran and the Zwinglian or "Sacramentarian" tenets. But when the latter was swallowed up in Calvinism, Debreczen rapidly became a Calvinist stronghold, with its famous church, college, library and press. It gradually came to be known as the Geneva of Hungary, while a distinction was drawn between "a magyar hit" (the Magyar faith) and the "német hit," by which was meant the German or Lutheran creed.

During the middle of the century the Magyar nobility defected steadily to Protestantism, and increasingly to Calvinism. By the death of Maximilian II. in 1576 it has been seriously asserted (though the statement is undoubtedly exaggerated) that only three of the great families were still Catholic.¹

While in North Hungary "the Confession of the Five Towns,"² drawn up in 1549, laid the basis of Lutheranism among the Magyars and Slovaks, Calvinism struck root in the great plains. In Transylvania (1556) John Sigismund Zápolya, the young Prince and titular King, gradually moved to the Left in a religious sense. With his backing the secularisation of Church property was effected, and its proceeds were at least partially devoted to education. The Diet in 1557 proclaimed mutual toleration—"every man," it laid down, "is at liberty to declare for the religion which pleases him: the use of the new or the old customs is left entirely to the free will of every man. But the adherents of the new faith are forbidden to cause each other offence." As a result Calvinism was organised with its centre at Klausenburg (Kolozsvár), under the Court preacher David, and in 1563 adopted

¹ Fessler, *Geschichte Ungarns*, III., p. 656.

² Kaschau, Eperjes, Bartfeld, Zeben, Leutschau.

the Genevan Confession of Beza.¹ In the following year the Diet recognised the right of every individual to opt freely for Klausenburg or Hermannstadt—that is, for Reformed or Lutheran, and in effect, as it has remained ever since, for Magyar or German. But the instability of doctrinal view in that age is revealed by the next and final stage in the Transylvanian Reformation. In 1556 David, and the no less influential Blandrata, an Italian who was the Prince's body physician, seceded from the Calvinist faith, and, infected by the close intercourse with Poland and its then powerful Socinian colonies, founded at Klausenburg the most famous of the Unitarian Churches of the Continent.

At last, after several violent public disputations between the rival sects, the situation was definitely stabilised in 1571, when the Diet passed a law recognising "the four Received Religions," namely, "the Evangelical-Reformed or Calvinist, the Lutheran or that of the Augsburg Confession, the Roman Catholic, and the Unitarian or Antitrinitarian," and assuring their free exercise and equal rights "for all time." (*für alle Zeiten*).² Thus to the three Received Nations are added the four Received Religions—thus composing that sevenfold basis of privilege which the famous Magyar patriot Wesselényi described in a cynical mood as the "Seven Deadly Sins of Transylvania." Transylvania becomes perhaps the most interesting field of experiment for religious tolerance, in the very epoch which history has branded as that of the Wars of Religion—an epoch when the young Reformed Churches had everywhere developed the same deadly fanaticism which they condemned so bitterly in their Catholic persecutors. It is true that tolerance was always relative. Apart from the seizure of Church lands, for which justification may be found, the Catholic Bishop of Transylvania was forced to leave the country, and it was not really till the XVIIIth century that the Catholic Church was able seriously to revive its organisation in Transylvania—a complete contrast to Habsburg Hungary during the XVIIth century, where the Counter-Reformation recovered a great portion of the ground lost in the preceding century.

The order in which the four religions are named in the Act just quoted is significant of the predominant position attained by Protestantism. Even under the Báthory Princes, who succeeded the semi-Unitarian John Sigismund, and who were zealously Catholic and under Jesuit influence, it appears that

¹ This followed on the so-called "Confessio Debreczeniana" of 1561.

² G. D. Teutsch, *op. cit.*, I., p. 233.

Catholicism was forced quite into the background, Stephen Báthory only hearing Mass or confessing in places removed from the public eye, or on hunting excursions. It is true that Stephen, after his accession to the Polish throne (1579), secured the return of the Jesuits to Transylvania, and their control of the education of the young Prince Sigismund, whose fickle and shifty character brought many troubles upon the country during the long struggle between Turkey, the Imperialists, Poland and Wallachia for its possession or control in the last decade of the seventeenth century. But in the long run this only served as a fresh incentive to Protestantism; the Imperialists, with their Italian mercenaries and their Jesuit advisers, provoked a strong reaction of national and religious feeling. In 1605 Transylvania rose and shook itself free, and for the next generation, under two such able Princes as Stephen Bocskai and Gabriel Bethlen, acquired a European position as one of the Protestant Powers, in treaty with Brandenburg, Saxony, Sweden, England and France.

There can be no question that with all its imperfections the Transylvanian religious settlement was far in advance of its age, and contrasts favourably with the conditions prevailing in any of the Western countries. But there was one flaw in particular which vitiates the whole system. As was pointed out earlier—the three privileged nations rigidly excluded from all political power the fourth, and not less numerous (in modern times far more numerous) Roumanian nation; and in the same way the equal rights assured to the four “received religions” were deliberately withheld from a Church which, at the most moderate estimate, had far more adherents than any one of the four—namely, the Orthodox or Eastern Church, to which all Roumanians, save the Magyarised nobles, adhered.

R. W. SETON-WATSON.

MEMORIALS OF THE CZECH REFORMATION.¹

THE finest time in the intellectual development of the Czech nation is the period in which its religious reformation was accomplished. Stimulated by the example of French and English thinkers, the Czech theologians, especially those at the University, began to reflect upon the moral regeneration of the Church, a surer path to salvation, and a juster order of society. At the head of this movement was the renowned Master John Hus (1369-1415), the foremost personality at the University of Prague, who paid the penalty for his doctrines, derived in part from John Wycliffe, and for his opposition to the authority of the Pope and the Œcumenical Council, by a martyr's death at Constance.

As his avengers, arose the Hussites, led by the heroic warrior John Žižka. The national cause, moral fervour, and the desire to reform society, guided them to victorious achievements.

Amid the greatest successes of the Hussite troops, Peter Chelčický (1390-1460), an unlearned squire from Southern Bohemia, severely criticised their fierce brawling in the name of the peace-loving law of Christ, and finally arrived at a repudiation of all war. Later on, his vehement peasant nature, his anti-historical instincts and his primitive Christian radicalism condemned the whole existing structure of society as not serving Christ but Antichrist.

The famous Unity of Czech (Moravian) Brethren, which declared itself to be Chelčický's offspring, remained faithful to the principles of brotherhood, democracy and mutual love, but did not adhere to Chelčický's anti-cultural views. Having become completely reconciled with humanism, mainly that of Germany, it developed an admirable educational system, historical and Biblical knowledge, hymnology and rhetoric.

From its ranks, but after the collapse of the Czech reformation, after the downfall of the national State and during the decay

¹ In translating the accompanying extracts from early Czech writers, an attempt has been made to reproduce the style and syntax of the originals. This explanation seems necessary, in view of the obscure and cumbrous passages which occur in places.—*Translator.*

of the national language, there appeared John Amos Komenský or Comenius (1592-1670), "the teacher of the nation," whose activities, however, extended beyond the frontiers of his native country. In his works the humanitarian and national aims of the Unity are combined with an encyclopædic output, and a passion for the reconciliation of peoples and the union of humanity. In all these respects Komenský is not merely a precursor of the 18th century, he is indeed a prophet who anticipated the noblest aspirations of our own age.

ARNE NOVAK.

The following four literary extracts illustrate these four main periods of the Czech reformation :

I. MASTER JOHN HUS : LETTER FROM CONSTANCE.

(Of the works of John Hus, the most individual are his letters, especially those which he wrote from prison at Constance immediately before his death. While in his theological writings he in the main follows his teachers, these intimate documents reveal his most vital traits : nobility of character, altruistic feeling, sense of moral responsibility and love for his nation).

10 June, 1415.

" Master Jan Hus, a servant of God in hope, unto all faithful Czechs who love and will love the Lord God, he uttereth his desire that the Lord God may vouchsafe it unto them to prevail in His Grace until their end, and to prevail in heavenly joy for ever and ever. Amen. Ye faithful and ye in God's grace, rich and poor, I entreat and admonish you to hearken unto the Lord God, to extol His word, and gladly to hear and fulfil it. I entreat you, as touching the truth of God, the which I did write from the law of God, and did preach and write from the utterances of the saints, that ye cleave fast to it. I likewise entreat any whosoever heard from me in my preaching, or privily, aught against the truth of God, or if I did anywhere write any such thing—the which, in God's name, I trust is not—that he keep not to it. I likewise entreat any who beheld in me wanton usage in talking or in deeds, that he keep not to them, but that for my sake he ask God to vouchsafe me forgiveness. I entreat the priests to love and extol good usages, and to esteem them, and especially those who labour in the word of God. I entreat you to beware of the crafty, concerning whom the Saviour saith that they are in sheep's clothing, but within are ravening wolves.

I entreat the lords to show mercy unto the poor, and to be righteous towards them. I entreat citizens to conduct their trade righteously. I entreat artizans to perform their labour and enjoy it righteously. I entreat servants to serve their masters and mistresses faithfully. I entreat teachers that, leading godly lives, they may instruct their pupils faithfully : foremost in order that they may love God, that they may study for his praise and for the weal of the community and for their own salvation : but not for covetousness or for worldly glorification. I entreat students and other pupils to hearken unto their masters and to follow them in what is good, and to learn diligently for God's praise and for the salvation of themselves and others. I entreat all in common to render thanks unto these lords : Lord Wenceslas of Duba, also of Lestina, Lord John of Chlum, Lord Henry of Plumlov, Lord William Zajic, Lord Myšek, and other lords of Bohemia and Moravia, and the faithful lords of the Polish kingdom, and to be grateful to their endeavour, that they many a time stood out against the whole council, both testifying and replying for my liberation, and especially regarding Lord Wenceslas of Duba and Lord John of Chlum, that ye believe what they shall declare : for they were in the council when I gave answer, for several days ; they know which of the Czechs and in what manner bore much and unmeet witness against me, in what manner I gave answer, what they asked of me. I likewise entreat you to pray the Lord God on behalf of his Royal Grace, King of Rome and Bohemia, and on behalf of his Queen, and on behalf of the lords, that the merciful Lord God may continue with them and with you in His mercy, now and hereafter in eternal joy. Amen.

“ I have written this letter to you in prison in chains, awaiting on the morrow to be condemned to death, having full hope in God, that I may not swerve from the truth of God, and that I may not disavow what the false witnesses have witnessed against me as errors. In what gracious manner the Lord God acteth unto me, and is with me amid sore temptations, ye shall know when we meet in God's presence in joy with His good help. Concerning Master Jerome, my beloved comrade, I do hear naught save that he is in heavy duress, awaiting death even as I, and this for his faith, the which he staunchly displayed unto the Czechs. And the Czechs, those who were our most cruel enemies, delivered us unto other enemies, unto their power and duress. I entreat you to pray God for them. Likewise do I entreat you, more especially the men of Prague, to show your

favour unto Bethlehem, as long as the Lord God may vouchsafe them to preach the word of God therein. I hope in the Lord God that He keep this place after His will, and accomplish therein greater profit through others than he did accomplish through me with my shortcomings. I likewise entreat you to love one another, to suffer not the good to be oppressed by violence, and to grant truth unto all.

“Written at night on the Monday before St. Vitus’ day.”

2. THE HUSSITE SONG: “YE WHO ARE WARRIORS OF GOD.”

(The whole spirit of the Hussite wars is reflected in the choral: “Ye who are warriors of God,” which according to tradition, and not without foundation, is attributed to John Žižka, the Hussite leader himself. The troublous times in which it was composed resulted in the blend of martial contents with a hymn setting. The military spirit combines with religious fervour to form a stirring chant which in character may be compared with the sentiments of the Puritan troops of Cromwell.)

“Ye who are warriors of God
And of his covenant,
Pray ye unto God for help,
And put your trust in him,
That in the end ye may ever with him have victory.

“Christ is your surety against harm,
And promiseth a hundredfold reward;
Wherefore he who layeth down his life for Him,
Shall find eternity.
Blessed is everyone who perisheth for the truth.

“And so the Lord exhorteth you
To scorn them who destroy the body,
And enjoineth you even to lay down your lives
For the love of your neighbours.

“Therefore ye men-at-arms, ye pikemen
Of knightly rank,
Ye halberdiers and flail-men
Of divers companies,
Ye all shall help the bountiful Lord.

“Fear ye not the enemy,
Gaze not upon his host,
Bear ye your Lord within your hearts,
Fight for Him with His help
And flee not from the enemy.

“ There is an old saying of the Czechs,
It is an adage among them,
That even as the Lord is good,
So shall the onslaught be good.

“ Bear ye all this watchword in mind,
Which is given unto you ;
Heed ye what your captains do,
Protect ye one the other,
Let each of you watch, and hold his battle-order

“ Ye camp-followers and troopers,
Take this well to heart :
Lest for covetousness and plundering
Ye should lose your lives,
And do not lag behind with booty.

“ And now right merrily ye shall shout
Crying : ‘ Onward, onward ; ’
Try ye your weapons with your hands,
‘ God is our Lord,’ so shall ye shout.”

3. PETER CHELČICKÝ—“ CONCERNING WAR AND CITIES.”

(Of the works of Peter Chelčický, whom Leo Tolstoy acknowledged as his predecessor, there are two which stand out as being most significant and extensive. From the “*Postilla*,” (*postilla*) or the Saviour’s explanations of the gospels for the whole year, a specimen is here quoted of his criticism of the Hussite wars and of warfare in general. The watchword of this passage is “*Disarm*,” a watchword not otherwise heard in the XVth century.

“ Thereupon the Saviour manifesteth the reason wherefore this great gift shall be on earth, and saith that it is for the mingling of the sound of the sea and the billows thereof. By the unquiet sea is signified sometimes a multitude of evil men, and sometimes a particular single one, even as saith the Lord God : ‘ Unkind as the restless sea, which cannot be quieted.’ This sound of the cruel sea and of the billows thereof our Czech land hath suffered much ; for well-nigh all the lands round about rose up against it from dissension in faith, so that the sound of those waves could be heard almost throughout the world. Also the raging of this sea can be, and oftentimes is wont to be, over earthly things ; for them doth the one party ever wage war against the other, desiring to exalt themselves above the others and to be their betters, and therefore do they wrangle and seize upon each other’s

possessions, upon men and honour, and therefore do they buffet one the other, burn one another, shed blood. Likewise also other sinful folk, like the sea unquiet and unquelled in evil, who are stirred by devils to unrest, that ever evil may go against evil, as waves of the sea against other waves, quarrel against quarrel, pride against pride, hardship against hardship—in one place they have slain one another, in another place robbed one another, in another place challenged one another, as desiring to slay or rob one another. And thus is the most mournful sound of this sea to be heard. And amid all the storms of this sea is temptation uttered unto the servants of Christ. Even as spake the Lord, saying : *When ye shall hear of wars and quarrels, fear not, for this sea shall not overwhelm you with its waves, neither shall a hair of your head perish ; if ye abide in me, my peace shall abide in you, and the storm of the sea shall pass by you.* And all these things, the which Christ here sayeth, do constrain us to hold ourselves in readiness, that we may be worthy of His coming."

4. JOHN AMOS COMENIUS. BEQUEST OF THE DYING MOTHER OF THE UNITY OF BRETHREN (1650).

(When all the hopes of the Unity of Czech Brethren had been destroyed after the Peace of Westphalia, Jan Amos Komenský, their last bishop, then at Lesno in Poland, recorded all that afflicted him, not only his private sorrows, but also his political disappointments. This heart-rending heritage of the Unity is, both in style and in subject-matter, one of the most powerful of the Czech works of Komenský, and altogether the best that was produced by the Czech reformation during the 250 years of its continuance. It was with words taken from this work of Komenský—"I too believe before God that after the passing of the storms of wrath . . . the rule over thine own possessions shall return to thee again, O Czech people"—that Professor Masaryk began the message which he delivered in December, 1918, when formally entering upon his duties as first President of the Czechoslovak Republic.)

"Thee, Czech and Moravian nation, beloved country, I cannot forget now that my parting from thee is over, but foremost in returning to thee, I make thee successor and foremost heir of my treasures, which the Lord entrusted unto me, after the example of sundry rich Roman citizens and neighbouring kings who, when dying, appointed the community of Rome, which held sway over a great span of the earth, as inheritor of

their possessions. I, too, believe before God that after the passing of the storms of wrath, brought down upon our heads by our sins, the rule over thine own possessions shall return to thee again, O Czech people! And for this hope do I make thee inheritor of everything not only all that I have inherited from my forefathers, and have preserved notwithstanding the troublous and grievous times, but also whatever increase I have received in any good work through the labour of my sons and the blessing of God, this all do I wholly bequeath and deliver to thee, and more especially :

“ In the first place, love for the pure truth of God, the which to us before other nations the Lord first began to manifest by the service of our master Jan Hus, and the which he with his fellow-worker and many other faithful Czechs sealed with his blood, and from which the Antichrist by his guile at the Council of Basel led thee away for that time and thereafter by warlike and cruel power, yet have I with my sons, who desired to follow the light, hitherto striven to cleave fast to it. Thine is this heritage, bestowed upon thee before other nations, O beloved country. Take possession of thine own rights again, as thine own, when the Lord showeth mercy unto thee, and the Lord, thy Saviour, restoreth a pathway unto his truth.

“ Secondly, I command unto thee a zealous desire for an ever fuller and clearer understanding of this same truth of God, that, knowing the Lord, thou endeavour to recognise him more abundantly. And whereas the Lord enjoined that the Holy Scriptures should be searched, I bequeath unto thee as a heritage the Book of God, the Holy Bible, which my sons did render from the original tongues (in which God ordained it to be written) into Czech with great diligence (sundry learned men spending unto fifteen years upon this labour), and the Lord God so blessed it, that few there are of nations yet which have heard the prophets and apostles speaking so faithfully, aptly and clearly in their own tongue. Take possession of this therefore as thine own jewel, beloved country, and employ this for the glory of God and thyself in good upbringing. And although copies of this Book of God were burnt by enemies, wherever they could lay hands on them, yet by the mercy of the same God, who ordered the Books of Jeremiah, torn up and burnt by the ungodly Jehoiakim, to be written anew, and the law of God, torn up and burnt by Antiochus the tyrant, soon afterwards, arousing the godly Ptolemy, caused to be rendered in the Greek tongue and conveyed to the knowledge

of other nations, so unto thee shall this Book of God be preserved, be sure and doubt not.

“ Thirdly, I do commend especially also love for the ordinances of the Church and this beloved doctrine (which should and must be among the children of God), that thereafter ye may count Christ not only as a prophet in the pulpit, not only as a priest and bishop by the altar, but also as a King with throne and sceptre to pass judgment over the disobedient. Now, what the Lord revealed unto me in his grace, that have I not hidden; it hath been brought unto the light. Do thou use this also, beloved country, for thine own good, either as has been done by me, or as may be discovered from the Holy Scriptures to be the most edifying way and after the example of the early apostolic Church! for to build upon old foundations, whenever the Temple of God is renewed, this is the safest.

“ Fourthly, I do impart zeal in serving the Lord God and in serving Him with single endeavour. What I have yearned for from my beginnings, that the memorials of my forefathers and the history written by Jan Lasicius concerning my affairs, do testify. This indeed could I myself not fully use, save that in the year 1575 I joined in common with my nation of both confessions, and in the year 1610 with the common consistory; but may God grant in his mercy (the which desire I will seal either with my life or my death, even as the Lord may command) that the third union may be the most perfect, a union of all the remainders of my children with all other remainders whatsoever of faithful Czechs, that the branch of Judah and the branch of Ephraim may be one branch in the hand of God, when our scattered bones are gathered together again, and are endued with flesh and skin and filled with the spirit of life by the Almighty Lord, unto whom nothing is impossible.

“ Fifthly, I do impart also unto thee and thy sons eagerness in the polishing, cleansing and fostering of our dear and beloved native language; wherein the devotion of my sons was known in bygone times, when by the more understanding persons it hath been said that there was no better Czech than that in use among the Brethren and in their books. But some there are now who have applied themselves thereunto even more diligently, also those driven forth from their country, that by the preparing of useful books and such as are written with a more cultivated pen than was previously the wont, they might help thy sons the more easily to attain all manner of noble comeliness in their deeds and speech, in wisdom and eloquence, a happy recompense for the

desolation now ensuing, until the Lord may bring about times of amendment. Whatsoever then of this may be found, of old books or new, this receiving from my sons, take as thine own for such use as shall seem best to thee.

“Sixthly, I bequeath to thee a better, more diligent and successful upbringing of youth than heretofore. This have I overlooked, entrusting myself to foreigners, who rendered my sons wanton and corrupt. If it had pleased God to restore me to more placid times, I would seek to make amends for this; but losing hope for myself, I entreat thee, beloved country, most importunately, that thou amend it. Divers of my sons have laboured likewise in this matter, and have prepared a method for the better upbringing of youth, the which other nations, without regard to religion, have begun to take in hand. But unto thee foremost it appertaineth, and when the time cometh, my sons, neglect not thine heritage, the which they are removing from thee. In short, all my remains, as ashes after my burning, unto thee, beloved country, do I commend, that thou therefrom may prepare lye for the cleansing of thy children from their stains; even as the Lord made me in my beginnings, by raising me and my children out of the ashes of Hus.

“But what more is there to say? The time is coming for me to cease and to bid you farewell, beloved country! But what then? Even as the patriarch Jacob, upon his death-bed bidding his sons farewell, gave unto them his blessing; even as Moses, departing from his people: from whose lips I taking the words, unto thee, O Czech nation, bidding thee farewell, utter a blessing from the Lord thy God, that thou above all be and remain a fruitful bough, a fruitful bough by a well, whose branches run over the wall. Notwithstanding that they have filled thee with bitterness and have shot arrows at thee, the archers holding thee in secret hatred, yet may thy bow abide in strength, and may the arms of thy hands be strengthened from the hands of the Mighty Jacob, from the powerful God, whom thy fathers served, who helpeth thee, and from the Almighty, who blesseth thee with the heavenly blessing from above, with the blessing of the deep-lying abyss, with the blessing of breast and body. May my blessing be stronger with thee than the blessing of my forefathers, even unto the regions of the eternal hills.

“Be of good cheer, O nation consecrated unto God; perish not. May thy men be without number. Bless, O Lord, their exploits, and may the toil of their hands be well pleasing unto Thee! Shatter the loins of their enemies, and of those who hate

them, that they rise no more ! May thy time come, that the nations may say : Blessed art thou, O Israel ; who is like unto thee, O people saved by the Lord, who is the shield of thy help and the sword of thine excellency ? Assuredly shall thine enemies be abased, that thou shalt tread upon their high places.

“Thine, O Lord, is the salvation, and upon the people be thy blessing, Selah.”

(Translated by P. Selver.)

THE EARLY DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND SERBIA. (II.)

V.

NONE of the steps taken by Ponsonby at the Porte with regard to Serbia met with open opposition on the part of Russia. Butenev, the Russian Ambassador at Constantinople, had been at St. Petersburg since January on long leave. When the Porte yielded to the insistence of Ponsonby that Miloš should be invited to send a deputation to Constantinople, it informed Baron Rückmann, the Russian Chargé d'Affaires, of this decision, in order to preserve a correct attitude towards St. Petersburg which might reasonably have protested against any one-sided action in matters relating to Serbia. The Porte stated that the object of this deputation would be to assist it in "investigating the present state of the country." Russia, however, knew that this initiative on the part of the Porte was due to British intervention and hastened to counteract action tending to destroy her "legal influence" in Serbia. To this end on 29 March the Vice-Chancellor, Count Nesselrode, sent urgent instructions to Baron Rückmann. The Prince of Serbia, he said, deeply annoyed at the invincible resistance which the Russian Cabinet opposed to his arbitrary and vexatious conduct, would like to free himself from this control, and to assure himself for this purpose of new support from foreign Powers. The British Consul perceived in this desire of Miloš a good way to paralyse Russian influence in Serbia and to substitute the intervention of England, a policy which was practised by British agents throughout the East. In this state of affairs Russia could not remain a passive witness "of the perfidious conduct of the Serbian Chief and the intrigues of England." In order to prevent in time the unpleasant consequences which might ensue from such a policy, Baron Rückmann was ordered, in the name of the Emperor, to tell the Ottoman Ministers, in the "most frank and positive language," that though Russia approved of the invitation to send a Serbian deputation to Constantinople, yet the treaties and Hattisheriffs

relating to Serbia must be completely fulfilled in the negotiations with her, and in such a way as to prevent "the authority of the Prince from becoming vexatious, or the immunities of the inhabitants from becoming abusive." Serbia must not be granted "either more or less" than what was in the treaties. Whatever might be done in this direction and in the spirit of the treaties would be accepted by Russia. Baron Rückmann was also to inform the Porte that Russia was cognisant of all the intrigues of Hodges and that the latter was endeavouring to induce Miloš to request the protection of England "in order to shelter himself from the responsible consequences of his improper administration"; that these underhand dealings of the British Consul could assuredly only merit "the contempt" of the Russian Government "as long as they were confined to Serbia itself and were only expressed in vague insinuations"; but that the Russian Government would adopt an entirely different attitude if these insinuations of Hodges, officially supported at Constantinople by the British Ambassador, should give place to more formal action. "Very serious inconvenience . . . might result from such interference on the part of England," seeing that the Emperor was resolved "not to permit any interference whatsoever on the part of Great Britain in the affairs of Serbia"; just as he did not tolerate her intervention in the affairs of Wallachia, about which an explanation took place recently between the two Powers. Hence, to prevent a conflict which would be very troublesome to the Porte itself, Russia considered it her duty to charge the latter "in the friendliest but most earnest manner, to decline from the start any advance on the part of Lord Ponsonby which tended to make the administrative interests of Serbia a matter for discussion." As was the custom in discussions with the Porte, Baron Rückmann was to suggest the answer to be given to England. The Porte had only to say that Serbian affairs had been regulated by special stipulations, and that it was out of the question that they should be made the subject of a political discussion with a third Power.¹ Baron Rückmann acquainted the Porte without delay "with his Government's point of view, and this communication was decisive for the conduct of the Porte in its dealings with the Serbian deputation."

When Hodges arrived at Constantinople, both the Porte and Lord Ponsonby were unable to consider immediately the

¹ 29 March, 1838. Nesselrode to Rückmann.

question of Serbia, as they were unexpectedly much occupied with several important and urgent matters. These were chiefly the affairs of Egypt and Persia, to say nothing of the commercial treaty between Turkey and Great Britain. The Ambassador asked Hodges, while waiting, to prepare for him a memorandum demonstrating all the advantages which the Porte would derive from supporting Miloš in his struggle against Russia.

Hodges set to work immediately, and dealt with all the questions we have already noticed, from the point of view of Turkish interests. The question of the Senate was, of course, the most important, together with the suggestion that Austria should be induced to support Miloš against Russia. He advised the Porte to counsel Miloš not to employ in his service the Serbs of Austria, who were all partisans of Russia and who had exhorted Miloš to acts which had offended Austria; they also aroused feelings of revolt in Bosnia and the adjoining provinces, and were disliked in Serbia. Indirectly, Hodges held them responsible for the fact that the Serbs and other Slavs of Turkey regarded Miloš as their liberator.

On 18 July Hodges showed the memorandum to the Ambassador, who approved of it and ordered a Turkish translation to be given to Reshid Pasha. On the 23rd Hodges handed the translation to Reshid, who promised to present it to the Sultan. On the Ambassador's instructions Hodges touched on the question of the evacuation of the town of Belgrade by the Turks in conformity with the Hattisheriff of 1830, adding that the Prince was ready to pay £30-40,000 sterling to the Porte for this concession, "and that even were £10,000 more necessary for the completion of this arrangement, such a sum would be forthcoming." Reshid Pasha promised to study the question, but he feared that the Sultan would object strongly to giving up the town of Belgrade.¹ On the whole Hodges was very satisfied with this interview, and even became optimistic as to the success of the whole Serbian question. In reporting to Palmerston on the memorandum and on his conversation with Reshid Pasha, he wrote: "The zealous and indefatigable exertions of His Excellency, Her Majesty's Ambassador here, encourage me to hope that we shall succeed, at least in part, in carrying into effect your Lordship's instructions as relating to Serbia; and should those expectations be realised, there can be no doubt of the important advantages which would result therefrom to the Ottoman Government, of the severe check thereby given to

¹ 27 July, 1838. Hodges to Palmerston.

Russian ambition, and of the vast increase to Great Britain, both in moral and political influence, not only in Serbia but throughout the Christian provinces adjoining."¹

Soon, however, Hodges gave way to a pessimistic outlook which could hardly be called exaggerated. In his subsequent conversations with Reshid Pasha, on whom the Ambassador counted most, Hodges saw that he was "so timid and undecided a politician as to render him almost useless in working out the great object which Her Majesty's Government has in view." He had seen that in general the importance of the Serbian question was not understood at Constantinople, and that those Turkish officials within whose sphere it lay were "pertinaciously disposed to yield to the desire of Russia for establishing in Serbia a Senate for life." Reshid Pasha himself was vacillating in the question of the Senate, and favoured a National Council which should continue for at least four years. Hodges, as well as the Ambassador, had protested against such a conception when inviting the Porte to open the Serbian question, now that it had the time for this task. The Commercial Treaty between Great Britain and Turkey had been signed on 16 August. The Porte continued its evasions, asserted that Russia had not openly intervened in the matter, but eventually recognised "that the dread to offend or to do anything which might dissatisfy the Russian Government prevents her acting in accordance with her own interests."² "I cannot refrain," wrote Hodges to Palmerston, "from stating plainly to your Lordship that since my sojourn here, I have on more than one occasion witnessed with feelings of regret and humiliation the preponderating influence of Russia and the difficulties which are studiously thrown in the way of yielding any political point to the demands or suggestions of Great Britain . . ." He had, he said, taken the liberty of telling Ponsonby that the Porte would not take any steps on the advice of Britain in opposition to Russian aggression "until Her Majesty's Government sees fitting to assume an attitude which will enable Her Majesty's Ambassador here to give to his remonstrances that authority which, I can see no reason to doubt, would be attended with entire success."³

Thus these importunate conversations continued without being succeeded by official action. Finally, towards the end of August, the deputies, assisted by Hodges and Stefanaki Bey

¹ 27 July, 1838. Hodges to Palmerston.

² 17 August, 1838. Hodges to Palmerston.

³ Ibid.

Prince of Samos, of whom Hodges, in contrast to his Chief, professed the greatest mistrust—determined upon a text of the Constitution for Serbia which was approved by Ponsonby. According to this draft the members of the Senate would not be appointed for life, the Prince was forbidden to indulge in commerce, monopolies were abolished and the ordinances of October, 1837, were to be upheld. The text was translated into Turkish and transmitted to the Porte, which in turn sent it to the Council to be examined in detail.

The prospects of success were rather unfavourable. Reshid Pasha, the pillar of British influence on the Bosphorus, had gone to London as Ambassador. On the other hand, Hodges received bad news from Serbia. When taking leave of Miloš he had recommended him to be tactful and patient in dealing with his opponents, and it seems that the Prince had, as far as he could, kept the promise he had given. His opponents, however, began to raise their heads, so that Miloš wrote to Hodges that he was about to use rigorous measures, and with Miloš one never knew where he would stop. The Princess Ljubica herself, whom Hodges had succeeded in reconciling with the Prince, had again joined her husband's enemies. Moreover, according to Miloš's letter, the Russian Consul, Vaschchenko, had come to Kragujevac and promised him everything he wanted if he would only abandon England. Of course Miloš exaggerated in order to stimulate the zeal of Hodges, but the latter thought it best to return to Serbia and keep an eye on the intrigues of his Russian colleague. On 17 August he wrote to Palmerston that, as the Serbian question could not be settled for another two months, and as Miloš needed his advice, he had decided, with the permission of the Ambassador—to whom he had given all necessary information—to leave Constantinople on the 27th.¹

There were, however, signs that the affairs of Serbia were about to be dealt with, and Hodges postponed his journey for another two weeks. Nothing came of them, and on 12 September he left Constantinople.

Before his departure he received positive information that the reason for the delay in settling the Serbian question was the fear that the Porte entertained of taking any decided steps until the return of the Russian Ambassador.²

He went with a heavy heart preoccupied with the fate of the Turkish Empire in general and the affairs of Prince Miloš in

¹ 17 August, 1838. Hodges to Palmerston.

² 5 October, 1838. Hodges to Palmerston.

particular. At Vidin he saw the famous Hussein Aga Pasha, who only confirmed him in the pessimistic view which he took, should the European Powers not decide to put an end to Russian ambitions in the East. Russia wanted Wallachia, Moldavia and Serbia, and then there would be an end of Bulgaria and Roumania.

On his return to Serbia Hodges passed 1 October at Požarevac, reporting to the Prince the state of the Serbian question at Constantinople. He took great care not to alarm him by expressing any doubts of a favourable settlement, but prepared him for a possible delay by remarking that if the Porte were disposed to yield to the demands of Russia, it would be better to let matters remain as they were, rather than have a Senate with dictatorial powers even for a given number of years. "I told the Prince, however, that I had no cause to entertain any such apprehensions, and I only thus speculated upon possibilities, to show the Prince that I was not ignorant of Russian intrigue in the Council of the Divan. I moreover remarked to the Prince that under the existing relations of the Porte with Great Britain, I had no reason to anticipate any disappointment in the fulfilment of our wishes regarding the question." The Prince thanked the British Government deeply for the services it had rendered him, promising to govern strictly according to the laws that had been promulgated, but expressing also his fear that the return of the Russian Ambassador to Constantinople would upset the measures which had been undertaken on behalf of Serbia. In this case, he said, he would not respect the Hattisheriff creating a Senate composed of life-members, and he hoped that the Sultan would not be annoyed, as the Porte would only have yielded to Russia from fear of displeasing her. In communicating these views of Miloš to Palmerston, Hodges added: "I would take leave to observe to your Lordship that, should the Porte indeed be so weak and insane as to submit to the dictation of Russia . . . unless instructed to the contrary, I shall deem it my duty to recommend the Prince to resist such an act." He concluded this communication by declaring that he was now more than ever convinced of Russia's ambitious designs on Serbia and the neighbouring provinces.

VI.

When Butenev arrived at Constantinople towards the end of September the Serbian delegates hastened to ask for an interview,

but the Ambassador delayed receiving them till after he had had his audience with the Sultan. They had hardly entered his presence when, with great anger and excitement, he reproached them for their relations with the British Embassy. The delegates excused themselves as best they could by saying that Great Britain had a representative at Belgrade and that they did not think they were doing any harm in going to see Lord Ponsonby. "I am well informed of your movements," answered Butenev. "I have heard both at Vienna and here of your efforts to get England to interfere in your affairs. Russia alone, as protecting Power, has the right to interfere." At the demand of the Ambassador the delegates explained to him their plan of a Constitution, which Ponsonby had approved and which had been delivered to the Porte before the departure of Hodges. "I will consult and work with the Sublime Porte on this subject," said Butenev. "The Porte has waited for my return, previous to the final arrangement of this affair. The Porte has confidence in me and will act according to my desire. I will do what is best for the Prince and for Serbia." The delegates reported this conversation to Miloš, adding, too, that they would no longer dare to communicate openly with the British Ambassador, but that they would keep in touch with him by other means.

Hitherto Miloš had always observed a certain measure of restraint in his relations with the Russian agents, and in general he refrained from committing himself openly. This time he saw that it was necessary to throw off his reserve and defend himself energetically against the pretension of the Russian Ambassador at Constantinople. As soon as he received the letter, Miloš sent instructions to the delegates to maintain open relations not only with Ponsonby, but also with the representatives of all the foreign Powers who were on friendly terms with Russia and the Porte and who took a friendly interest in Serbian affairs. If Butenev continued to reproach them, they were to inform him of the Prince's instructions, and to add that they "looked upon the prohibition to visit our acquaintances freely as limitations of our individual liberty—limitations made only for slaves and not for free men, delegates of a Prince and of a nation."¹

The Russian agent in Serbia spoke to the Prince in practically the same terms that his chief used to the delegates at Constantinople. On 9 October, Vaschchenko had gone to Kragujevac to see the Prince, "who received him with a repugnance that

¹ 6 October, 1838. Miloš to the Deputies; Hodges to Palmerston, 9 October.

cannot be mistaken." On this occasion he had asked Miloš why he had mixed himself up with the British Government and why he had given credit to the assurances of Hodges that the Serbian question had been arranged at Constantinople previous to the latter's departure and in accordance with the wishes of the Prince, whereas, in reality, the Porte had only begun to consider the question after the return of Butenev: "You see, therefore, that you ought to give no credit to these false assurances if you reckon in any way upon the protection of Russia. . . . You were yourself the cause of England having interfered in the Serbian question at Constantinople and elsewhere" Miloš replied sharply that Vaschchenko would never be able to dictate to him with whom he might maintain relations, and begged him to leave him alone.¹

Hodges, feeling the whole tragedy of Miloš, who was the dupe of his policy, and who had fallen into a trap in sending the deputation to Constantinople, was sensible of his own responsibility and that of his Government, to which he did not cease to suggest ideas and which he continually urged to action. On 5 October he suggested to Palmerston that the latter should discuss the affairs of Serbia with Reshid Pasha in London; on the 10th he expressed the conviction he had acquired in Constantinople that the Sultan and his Ministers had had enough of Russia, and were anxious to free themselves from her domination. For this, however, they expected some decided demonstration in their favour on the part of Great Britain, such as should prove to them her capacity to help them promptly and in a way that would prevent the Russian Army and Navy from entering Constantinople.² In another letter of the same date he wrote: "Prince Miloš is now solely and entirely dependent upon the honour and good faith of Her Majesty's Government, whose support and protection, he has repeatedly told me, he feels they have pledged to him; and it is no doubt needless for me so often to repeat to your Lordship, that upon the maintenance of Serbian independence entirely rests the preservation of all the provinces of European Turkey from Russian domination and control; on the other hand, should it be possible that Her Majesty's Government may deem it in any way expedient to abandon the interests of Serbia and expose Prince Miloš to the vengeance of Russia, British influence would cease to exist throughout European Turkey, and all confidence in future

¹ 15 October, 1838. Hodges to Palmerston.

² 10 October, 1838. No. 30, Hodges to Palmerston.

assurances of Her Majesty's Government as regards them, would ever again be received at least with suspicion."¹

On 7 November Lord Palmerston approved Hodges's idea of advising the Prince not to accept the Senate of life-members which the Porte might endeavour to impose on him at the demand of Russia, but this refusal was not to be in a peremptory form. Without making a positive declaration of refusal, which might give Russia a pretext for urging on the Porte measures of compulsion, or for offering her aid to the Porte, Miloš was to submit his remonstrances in writing, and by a prolonged correspondence postpone the matter indefinitely. It was probable that the Porte would itself favour this delay.² In another letter of the same date, in reply to Hodges's letter of 10 October, Palmerston thought it necessary to give Hodges the real measure of the aid which Miloš might expect from Great Britain. He referred him to the instructions which he had given him on 14 April concerning the advice he should give to the Prince—namely, that if Miloš were careful not to give needless offence to Russia by any lack of courtesy or outward civility towards the Russian Consul, Britain would certainly use all her moral influence to support him. "But," added Lord Palmerston, "it must be evident to all that the geographical position of Serbia must prevent Great Britain from affording to His Highness any active and effectual physical aid, unless by declaring war against Russia, and it is not to be expected that England should go to war against Russia for the Serbian question alone."³ Indeed, in October Palmerston had repeated his instructions to Ponsonby, "to miss no opportunity of impressing upon the Porte the importance of conciliating Prince Miloš and of supporting him in opposition to the intrigues of a party who were merely partisans of Russia."⁴

After the return of Boutenev the delegates repeatedly pressed the Porte to approve the draft constitution which they had submitted; but while waiting to be invited by the Ambassador to discuss the question with him, the Porte urged, through the medium of the Prince of Samos, all sorts of objections to the scheme. It even raised a claim to very important modifications of the Hattisheriffs of 1830 and 1833—notably, that Serbia should cede to the Turks "a belt" round the fortress of Belgrade and other fortresses in Serbia. For the Porte the question of the

¹ 10 October. No. 29, Hodges to Palmerston.

² 7 November, 1838. No. 23, Palmerston to Hodges.

³ 7 November, 1838, No. 24: Palmerston to Hodges.

⁴ 7 October, 1838, No. 199: Palmerston to Ponsonby.

Serbian constitution was only a thread in the fabric of intrigue from which it hoped to profit. The delegates felt the whole humiliation of their position in having come to Constantinople to ask for a constitution from the Turks, who themselves did not possess one, and who also regarded Serbia with hatred and distrust. Boutenev, sure of Russia's influence over the Divan and of her right to interfere in the matter, regarded their proceedings with a sulky indifference. Lord Ponsonby, just when he should have been most active, was incapable of a firm and prolonged effort. Hodges had left him in a very bad state of health after a fall from his horse, and he remained permanently ill and weak. It was the dragoman of the Embassy, Pisani, and a certain Franceschi, editor of the *Ottoman Monitor*, and confidential agent of the Turkish Government, who, with the deputies, had to defend the point of view of Prince Miloš. Franceschi, to whom Miloš at Hodges's request had given a good present, maintained confidential relations with the delegate Živanović. He drew up, as a journalist, the replies of the deputation, which the Prince of Samos translated into Turkish for the Porte. So low had fallen the great scheme which Ponsonby himself had conceived for combatting Russian influence in Serbia.

About 17 October the Porte informed the deputies that it was ready to confirm the institutions which they demanded, provided they were approved by the Serbian National Assembly. Whether or not the Porte was sincere, such a step certainly offered the best solution. It was a sheet-anchor for Miloš, and without doubt his last chance of avoiding the imposition by Constantinople of the solution which he maintained to be contrary to his own desire and to that of the people. Ponsonby had realised the full importance of this move on the part of the Porte. When the delegates called upon him on 18 October, he told them that if a National Assembly, in agreement with the Prince, demanded the institutions laid down in the scheme submitted to the Porte, the situation would be completely restored, and, asserting that he would defend this plan against anyone, he almost took upon himself to guarantee its success.

A national consultation might be all the more favourable to the Prince since Turkey had advanced such claims as the fortress "belts," which might easily rally the people round him. The Prince did not, however, hasten to answer the Porte by convoking a national assembly: for in the uncertain mood of the nation, this might play into the hands of his enemies, just as the sending of the deputation had turned out to his own disadvantage.

After receiving the deputies' reports on 19 and 21 October, he spent several days in travel in order to study the humour of the people. It was not until 5 November that he sent them a long reply in which he declared, with many repetitions—and sometimes with artless and rather forced arguments—that the Porte ought to approve his plan for a constitution by annulling the article of the Hattisheriff concerning the irremovability of the members of the Senate, and that this would meet not only his own wishes, but those of the people. "The Porte must know," he added, "that Russia hates us and cries out against us because we resolved to recognise no other master than the Sultan." . . . "We interpret the protection of Russia solely in the sense that she is to protect Serbia from foreign aggression and that she is to guard the integrity of her rights and privileges; as to internal affairs and administration, however, these concern the Prince and the nation." If the Porte wished to avoid the interference of a foreign Power in the affairs of Serbia, it should make a stand against these intrigues and confirm to Serbia the organic institutions which she demanded. With regard to the most important question, the national consultation about the constitution, Miloš adopted dilatory tactics. If the Porte, he said, continued to demand the approval of the National Assembly for the scheme which the delegates had submitted, then they were to ask for a firman *ad hoc*. As soon as this firman was received, the National Assembly would be convoked and the draft constitution sent to Constantinople, furnished with the signatures of the Assembly. If the Porte did not accept this proposal, or if it did not approve of the plan submitted, the deputation would be recalled, and then, said Miloš, "we shall constitute ourselves here as best we can, without the intervention of anyone whatsoever. At the same time we assure the Sublime Porte that we shall never do anything which is opposed to our duties towards it, and if anyone wishes to violate the freedom of interior administration which we possess, we shall protest before all the world, and we shall defend our rights with all possible vigour."¹ In another letter to the delegates of the same date, Miloš declared that without the firman he could not convoke the Assembly, "as all the world knows that the question of our institutions is being dealt with at Constantinople." Should the Porte not confirm what the Assembly demanded, he would, without the firman, be compromised in the eyes of the people. If the Porte did not accept either of the two demands, they

¹ 5 November (24 October), 1838: Miloš to the Deputies.

were to ask permission to leave Constantinople. He urged them to take all possible steps, "both at the Sublime Porte and with the British Ambassador and anyone else from whom assistance may be expected, to terminate our affairs in the manner indicated." The delegation was even to request an audience with Hosrev Pasha, the President of the Imperial Council. At the same time he wrote to Nuri Effendi, who had succeeded Reshid Pasha as Foreign Minister, begging him to lend an ear to the requests of his delegates and to lay his petition at the feet of the Sultan.¹

VII.

After having given these instructions Miloš continued his journey through the country, with the evident object of propaganda and agitation against his adversaries. The latter became alarmed and redoubled their counter-agitation, which was all the more dangerous because it was secret. The rumour was spread that Miloš had rejected Russia's protection and accepted that of Britain, that he intended to introduce Catholicism and sell the country to strangers—in a word, everything that was calculated to rouse popular indignation. On 16 November Vučić, the chief conspirator, wrote to Petronijević, who was at the head of the delegation in Constantinople, that a revolt and disorders might be expected, at any moment, as the result of this double propaganda. "Heaven alone knows what may happen in a few days. You know that everybody is excited; we expect a revolt which may break out on all sides. He [Miloš] does not know this; that is why he rages and rushes about from one place to another, to show himself amiable to the people. . . . I repeat that the conflagration may break out at any moment; we expect it any second and are ready to face any eventuality." Disquieted and anxious for their own safety, the chiefs sent to the Prince a man who was greatly esteemed by him, with instructions to inform him openly that they were aware of all his designs and intentions, which he should abandon, and that he should return to Russia and to them, in order that they might work together for the welfare of the country; also that to rouse the people would not profit him, but might on the contrary bring about his own fall, an eventuality which the chiefs did not desire. Miloš replied that he had never intended either to quarrel with them or to break with Russia: and the campaign on both sides was continued more energetically than ever.

¹ 5 November (24 October), 1838: Miloš to Nuri Effendi.

Hodges was certainly well aware of all that was happening in the country and he knew the full extent of the Prince's agitation. By the second half of the month he was in possession of Palmerston's instructions of 7 November, and also of a letter from Ponsonby based upon instructions from London. He therefore wrote to the Prince, praising his conduct, recommending tact and courage and urging him to convoke a National Assembly. On 27 November, alluding to the Prince's difficulties and the intrigues against him, he wrote: "It is by the advice of Lord Ponsonby that I propose the convocation of a general assembly of the people to fix the basis of general security and tranquillity, and to represent the wants and wishes of the Serbian people to the Sublime Porte." This had to be done without delay. Hodges made only one reservation: the Prince was to convoke the Assembly if he considered it under existing circumstances to be "a safe and prudent measure."¹ Two days later he wrote again in almost the same terms: "Your Highness has more than once assured me that the Serbian people are devoted to your person, that they identify the welfare of their country with yours and that you rely upon their loyalty and patriotism. Such being the case, there can be neither danger nor disadvantage in calling together without loss of time a general assembly and in exposing freely and candidly your Highness's present political position, your pending negotiations in Constantinople, the unexpected demand of the Turkish Government for a surrender of territory around Belgrade and other fortified towns, and your terms of intercourse with the Sublime Porte, with Russia and with other Powers of Europe."² Hodges added that the desire of his Government was that the Serbian people should know that Great Britain was not aiming at aggrandisement, that her desire was to uphold Turkey, and that with this view she offered Serbia her support in what was possible and practicable against the enemies of the Sublime Porte. "I am instructed to inform your Highness that Her Majesty's Government will continue to afford you this support."³ In case the Porte, at the instigation of Russia, should impose on Serbia a Senate of life-members, or one appointed for a stated number of years, Hodges in his letter of 28 November, in the name of the British Government, advised the Prince "to resist this measure on the ground of its being injurious to the Ottoman Empire, and because the concurrence

¹ 27 November, 1838: Hodges to Miloš.

² 29 November, 1838: Hodges to Miloš.

³ 29 November, 1838: Hodges to Miloš.

of the Turkish Government could only have been given through fear." "I am, moreover, desired to observe that Her Majesty's Government conceive that, without resorting to a positive refusal to adopt the measure and thereby affording Russia the pretext of offering her assistance to the Sublime Porte, your Highness might complain of the proceeding and by a protracted correspondence retard indefinitely a decision."¹

Miloš admitted in principle the recommendations of Hodges with regard to the National Assembly, and declared himself ready to convoke it if the Porte rejected his plan for a constitution. But he certainly did not mean this seriously, for he was too accustomed to diplomacy to face the difficulties and dangers of a National Assembly. He continued to hope for good results from the action of his delegates at Constantinople, from British intervention and perhaps from some *deus ex machina* such as had so often extracted him from the greatest embarrassments. He did all he could to stimulate the zeal of Hodges, and told him through his private secretary: "Hitherto England has only *indirectly* interfered on our behalf, while Russia openly approached the Sultan and opposed herself to my propositions. The Porte acquainted my deputies that they would *officially* inform Russia of their decision as regards the institutions fitting for this country and that they (the Turkish Government) would acquaint Lord Ponsonby *privately*. Russia has no more right than England to interfere in our *internal* government; and why does the Porte make this distinction between the two Powers?"² When Hodges told him in reply to await calmly and patiently the result of the steps taken by Lord Ponsonby, Miloš answered: "I would gladly wait, but Russia will not let me; whilst *you* and *I* are waiting, *she* is working hard against us . . . even to excite a revolt in Serbia. I tell you that Russia is conspiring against me even in my very palace." He also informed him reproachfully that "he would never have consented to send a deputation to Constantinople, were it not with the conviction that it would have been successfully supported by Her Majesty's Government."

By sending to Palmerston the Prince's declaration that Great Britain had never officially intervened at Constantinople, Hodges discreetly indicated the orders to be given to Ponsonby. He added his direct answer to Palmerston's with regard to the latter's reminder that Britain could not go to war with Russia solely

¹ 28 November, 1838: Hodges to Miloš.

² 13 December, 1838: Hodges to Palmerston.

on account of Serbia: "I am sure that Prince Miloš has too clear and just a judgment to conceive that Her Majesty's Government would resort to war on account of the Serbian question only. I believe that all he expects from England is a vigorous demonstration of moral force in aiding him to obtain the justice he solicits from the Sublime Porte."¹

VIII.

On 15 November the deputies received their final instructions, which were dated the 6th. On the 18th they called on Ponsonby to inform him that the Prince's definite instructions were for a Senate with "members named and removable by the Prince. . . . A council composed of members not subject to removal would mean the establishment of an oligarchy in Serbia useful only to the enemies of the Sultan." The deputies also detailed to him the arguments they were about to employ with the Porte in order to arrive at the result desired by the Prince. "As protector Russia is competent to support the Serbians with her good offices . . . but is not competent . . . to oppose and defeat the wishes of the Serbian Government and people. The Sultan in his sovereign capacity was pleased by a former Hattisheriff to direct the formation of a Council consisting of life-members, so his Highness is now free to exert this prerogative in compliance with the prayer of the Serbians and to establish a Council of another sort."

Ponsonby informed Palmerston that he would help the deputies in an indirect manner, by explaining to influential officials at the Porte the dangers to which the Sultan would expose himself if he submitted to the demands of Russia and thus provoked discontent among the Serbians. Nevertheless the Ambassador did not delude himself about the result of their efforts. "I have not," he wrote to Palmerston, "much belief in their success, as they have to do with inefficient and timid ministers."²

At the moment Ponsonby was writing these lines, the question of the Serbian Constitution was in its final stage. The Porte had already communicated to the Russian Ambassador a scheme for organic laws, which was in conformity with the desires of Prince Miloš and had been elaborated on the basis suggested by the deputies. As a matter of fact the Porte had formulated two such schemes, one with a Senate of life-members, the other with a Senate whose members should be removable, and while the

¹ 13 December, 1838, No. 44: Hodges to Palmerston.

² 18 November, 1838: Ponsonby to Palmerston.

deputies were informed of the first plan, the second one was sent to the Ambassador, the Porte being ready to yield where the pressure should be greatest. About 20 November the Porte communicated confidentially to the British Ambassador the memorandum of Butenev concerning the plan favoured by Miloš.

In this document, after the usual compliments to the Porte, the Russian Ambassador, "guided by his duty and anxious to justify the confidence of the Porte," submitted "a few observations on the contents of the plan." "The first and most important of these," he said, "refers to the omission, apparently accidental and involuntary, of one of the most essential clauses of the Hattisheriff of 1830, namely, the paragraph concerning the members of the Serbian Council of Notables." After quoting the original text, Butenev added: "This very clear and positive clause, having been the principal guarantee which was established with anxious forethought by the Hattisheriff of 1830, in order to prevent the possibility of any abuse or arbitrary intent on the part of the executive authorities of the country, should naturally be reproduced word for word in the contemplated Organic Code. It is obvious that the omission of a clause of such importance would be a deviation from the above-mentioned Hattisheriff, and would deprive the Serbian nation of the guarantee which was assured them by the said clause." In paragraph 5 of the Memorandum the Ambassador spoke of the National Assembly—*Narodna Skupština*—which "according to ancient custom among the Serbians it is the practice of the ruler of the country to call together on the most important occasions, such, for example, as the proclamation of Hattisheriffs and decrees of the Sublime Porte, the modification of taxes or any other national occasion. It seems that the continuance of this practice should be mentioned in the present code, especially as such an Assembly will undoubtedly be the surest means of bringing home to all classes of the Serbian nation the new benefits conferred by this act of the Sovereign Power." Butenev also suggested that there should be quoted in the Hattisheriff "an ordinance provisionally issued by Prince Miloš" on the occasion of the mission of Prince Dolgoruki in October, 1837. His further observations are not of great interest. The only thing he demanded in peremptory fashion was that the members of the Senate should be appointed for life. Finally he alluded to British intervention in the Serbian question, and stated that the matters dealt with in the forthcoming Hattisheriff were "within the exclusive

domain" of Russia and the Porte, and consequently "the interference of a third party would never be permitted."

In consequence of this communication Ponsonby was invited by the Porte to suggest the arguments which might be opposed to the observations of Russia. Ponsonby complied and sent the Porte the confidential draft of a reply, written by Pisani, Franceschi and Stefanaki Bey in agreement with the Ambassador, and enumerating all the objections to a Senate with life-members. Miloš was the Porte's deputy in Serbia, and by a Senate such as the one demanded by Russia his authority would be diminished; such a Senate would be "a government within the Government itself," and would mean the creation of a rival oligarchy, jealous of the Prince's authority; its irremovability would exclude men of talent, who would not have the opportunity of replacing incapable members, and so on. With regard to the principle that the irremovability of the Senate was not susceptible to change, the draft states that this irremovability was prescribed by the Hattisheriff of 1830, because the Porte then thought it expedient; it was, however, an act emanating solely from the will of the Sultan, who had the power to change the prescription now that experience had proved that it no longer corresponded to the need of the country.

The most interesting point in the draft is the argument against the National Assembly, the recording of which in the Organic Code was demanded by Butenev: "In the fifth observation the Imperial Mission proposes to the Sublime Porte that the continuance of the Serbian Assembly of Notables, which in accordance with ancient custom it is the practice of the ruler of the country to summon on certain important occasions, should be mentioned in the Organic Code. Would not the recognition and legitimation of such a practice by the Sublime Porte have the appearance of introducing into the administrative organisation of Serbia an institution which is incompatible with the present situation, and which, influenced by a factious spirit, would tend to exceed the limit of its functions, and might compromise both the reigning authority and public order, by presenting a vast field for discord and internal commotions? Therefore without making in the code itself any declaration with regard to the continuance or abandonment of the custom, the Sublime Porte would find it more expedient to entrust to the prudence and responsibility of the Prince the publication of the present code in the least disturbing way, and as would best conform to the practice of the country."

This paragraph of the counter-plan is certainly an expression of the complete ignorance of its authors with regard to Serbian affairs. Later on, the accusation was raised in Serbia that Britain had been opposed to the institution of the National Assembly, and Hodges attributed this fault to Ponsonby.

In this draft it was proposed that the deputations through which Serbia from time to time submitted her requests to the Sultan, should be replaced by a special representative, the "Kapou-Kehaya," who knew the language and customs of the Turks. Moreover it was affirmed that the Porte had decided to appoint such an agent, and that this decision, at the express command of the Sultan, had been transmitted to Prince Miloš through the Pasha of Belgrade. It was Stefanaki Bey, the Prince of Samos, one of the authors of the draft reply, who coveted this lucrative post.

The draft reply opposed Butenev's demand that the ordinances of October, 1837, should be embodied in the code: "The Sublime Porte would consider the quotation thereof useless, and hardly in accordance with the dignity of an act emanating from the sovereign will." Finally the Porte's demand was upheld, that it should have "a belt" round the fortresses, a concession which the Russian Ambassador had refused as being contrary both to the treaties and to the Hattisheriffs.

Ponsonby probably did not attach any great importance to this document. His principal object was to gain time. On 24 November he wrote to Palmerston: "My object is to keep that business unsettled till I have first instructions from Her Majesty's Government. The Russians will assuredly reject the arrangements in the enclosed draft of the reply to be made by the Sublime Porte, and time will be gained and the commission of a Hattisheriff by the Sultan avoided for the present, in which the demands of the Russians should be conceded and the interests of Miloš . . . and of the Ottoman Porte sacrificed to the policy of Russia, by vesting uncontrolled power in an oligarchy composed of needy men and blind partisans of Russia."

It was only on 2 December that the deputies had submitted to the Porte the new plan of an Organic Code and the observations that the Prince had sent to them on 6 November. In this task they had had the assistance of the dragoman of the British Embassy. It was, in short, still the question of the Senate round which this new effort turned, and the plan was after all only a repetition of that which deputies had so often

The Secret (8); *The Kiss* (9); *The Brandenburghers in Bohemia* (3); *The Devil's Wall* (7); *Libuša* (5). DVOŘÁK.—*Jakobín* (8); *Rusalka* (9); *The Devil and Kate* (4); *The Peasant a Rogue* (9). FIBICH.—*Šarka* (4); *The Tempest* (7); *The Bride of Messina* (3). KOVAŘOVIC.—*Psohlavci* (*Peasant's Charter*) (8); *At the Old Bleaching House* (10). LEOŠ JANÁČEK.—*Pastorkyňa* (*The Stepdaughter*) (6); *The Excursions of Mr. Brouček* (7). FOERSTER.—*Eva* (4); *The Unconquered* (1); *Jessika* (8). V. NOVÁK.—*Karlstein* (3); *The Imp of Zvíkov* (2). OSTRČIL.—*The Bud* (1). KARL WEISS.—*The Forest Smithy* (7). Besides these Czech operas. works by Auber, Bizet, Massenet, Charpentier, Ambrose Thomas and Delibes were given; Italian operas by Verdi and Puccini; Chaykovsky's *Eugeny Onegin* and Mussorgsky's *Boris Godunov*; Mozart—not so often as in Kovařovic's time—but some twenty times during the season. In addition a good many ballets, both Czech and foreign, have been presented. Since 1919 conditions have greatly improved in the provinces.

At Brno, the capital of Moravia and the second town in point of population in the Republic, the Municipal Theatre (with a stage as large as that of the Národní Divadlo at Prague) has been taken over entirely as the Czech National Opera—the Germans having another suitable building in the town. Here, under the discipline of an admirable and experienced conductor, František Neumann, I found an Opera which is very little—if indeed at all—inferior to that of Prague. The general musical atmosphere is rather less conservative than in Prague. Such new operas as Krička's *Ogaři* and Neumann's *Æquinox* have been produced during the short duration of its existence. In Brno, too, the influence of that remarkable musical personality, Leoš Janáček, reigns supreme, and his operas are very well given under Neumann. Presumably the young rising school of Moravian composers will get a chance of being heard here, as soon as one of them has a work ready for the ordeal of a first production.

In Bratislava, the new capital of Slovakia (formerly Pressburg) I found that a National Opera had also been established since 1919, under the capable conductorship of Zuna. I heard a very fair performance of Smetana's *Dalibor*, although as yet the orchestra is not on a level with that of Prague or Brno, and economies are still necessary in the matter of engaging experienced soloists. In fact, although the Conservatoires are all active, it must be difficult to find a sufficient supply of capable Czech singers. But perfection cannot be attained in the first two seasons of an opera established in a town in which so many

political and racial interests are still in conflict. Here a compromise has been effected. The Bratislava Opera House is used by the Czechs for half the year, and by the Germans for the other half. The Czech company then migrates to the far eastern town of Košice in the heart of Slovakia.

A younger school of Slovak musicians is in active existence, its leaders being Figuš Bistrý, Schneider-Trnavsky, Desider Lanko, and Kafendo. The only Slovak, as far as I know, who has composed an opera (*Rea Silvia*) and several operettas, is Dr. Miloš Francisci.

There are now already twelve centres in the Republic in which longer or shorter periods of Opera can be enjoyed : Prague, a permanent centre; Brno, a permanent centre; Bratislava, six months; Pilsen; the East-Bohemian Theatre; the South-Bohemian Theatre at Budějovice; the Moravo-Silesian Theatre at Moravian Ostrava; and more occasionally at Karlový Varý (Karlsbad), Olomouc, and Pardobice. Of course the standard of performance varies greatly; where there is not much municipal support, and no permanent orchestra, I have seen performances of great operas which could not but provoke a smile from the sophisticated, mingled with respect for the enthusiasm which pulled the thing through. But, good or bad, the theatres are always crowded, and the passages blocked with those willing to stand, in a fashion that would scandalise the authorities in this country.

And this passion for opera must increase, because children are taken to hear it almost before they are out of arms. Children of all classes—places being given to the pupils in the primary schools for the matinées of suitable operas. Children of richer parents go to everything, suitable or not. An intelligent Czech child of twelve knows the whole operatic repertory, from Blodek's comic opera *In the Well*, to the strong meat of Janáček's *Pastorkyňa*. In this way a renewed generation of determined opera-goers is always in process of making.

In Moravia (and Slovakia), ardour for the Folk art has inspired the painter Uprka, and a whole group of musicians, of whom Leoš Janáček is the most distinguished. He was born at Hukwald, Moravia, in 1854; but let no one picture him as a fossilised, elderly, provincial musician. He is the most vitalised young man of sixty-eight I ever met. Janáček began life as a church chorister under the famous Bohemian choral composer and folksong collector, Křižkovsky. He was twenty-five before he succeeded in getting to the Leipzig Conservatorium, where

he ran through the courses with extraordinary rapidity, but felt the musical atmosphere unsympathetic to his ideals. He went on to Vienna, where he studied the piano with the idea of appearing as a virtuoso. Fortunately circumstances were against this, and in 1882 he returned to Brno, where he was appointed conductor of the Philharmonic Society and Director of the School of Organists. I have been told that he was an excellent conductor, especially of choral bodies—alert, exacting, and determined to get the effects he had in view. Towards the end of last century he composed some very powerful and original male voice choruses, now sung from end to end of Czechoslovakia. Two or three were introduced here by the Prague and Moravian Teachers' Choirs, during the Czechoslovak Musical Festival of 1919.

If I say that Janáček, since 1916, occupies the most prominent place in dramatic music, and is the dominating figure in the world of Bohemian art, I shall inevitably be asked: "What was this genius doing up to his sixtieth year?" And I shall give an answer that would probably be Janáček's: "Working out my ideas in comparative obscurity, working—and always learning." His tardy triumph with his Moravian music-drama *Její Pastorkyňa* in 1916 is comparable with the sudden, belated apparition of William de Morgan in literature. The lack of earlier appreciation seems to me regrettable, because, with all his energy, the time is drawing late for the production of many more masterpieces. But I take consolation in remembering that Verdi's *Falstaff* appeared in the composer's eighty-first year. Perhaps in Janáček's case this retarded success was the inevitable result of his way of development. His patient researches into the folk-songs led slowly and almost imperceptibly to a profound study of the connection between song and speech, and then only he evolved the method of expression which suited his operatic ideas. From time to time he has reported his progress in the study of the folk-music in a series of articles which are written in a crisp, rather combative style.

He believes the folk-songs were often the joint production of a group of exceptionally talented people and proceeded from their receptivity and power of imitation. For him, "the folk-song is a living cell, and even its fragments are endowed with vitality and mobility; it has been, and can continue to be, modified; it has decayed—and still decays—on the lips of unintelligent and irreverent singers. . . . Song lives by, and in, speech; the whole spirit of the Czech people is manifested in their speech; to every word they utter is attached a fragment of the national

life. . . . Therefore the melody of the people's speech should be studied in every detail." . . . "It seems," he says, "that for individual musical characterisation—especially opera—these melodic fragments from daily life are of the greatest significance. By them we shall hit on the truth; we shall grasp how the human individual utters words of love; with what intensity he expresses his hate; we shall discover the melodic curve of energy; we shall hear how tenderly is rounded off the phrase which comes from the goodness of a woman's heart." And elsewhere he says: "On the stage, it is not always the best word for vocalising that we require; we need the every-day word, its melodic turn, torn from life, misery congealed, despair in sharp relief. Real life is needed in opera: instead, we get, too often, the melody of song and the dance. . . . The cutting of the harvest has its own naturalistic music; the prattle of conversation is quite different to the snarl of the hand-organ. The sounds of agricultural life, the passing of tipsy recruits have their individual melodic noises. The artistic fabric, woven of tones, must—for dramatic music—have form and colour, pliability, variety, and the flush of life." Of his own studies in melodic speech, he says: "I follow the tracks of sound in life as they pass my way: in the street or in the drawing-room. I listen to the gnat as it hums around at night; to the bee, when in the heat of the sun it seeks water in some puddle; to the murmur of the telegraph wires. But with the greatest eagerness I listen for the human soul revealing itself in speech; one speaks in a confident tone; another contradicts assertively; another speaks sharply in anger—and all these are the harmonic tones of my surroundings, from the rumbling of the summer storm to the miniature peal heard in my own ears in dead silence and solitude. All these are motives, stamped deeply into my mind, but I do not use them for composition. It is thus that one may study music."

This long assiduous preoccupation with these theories of song and speech might have degenerated into a mere hobby and damped the creative ardour of a less gifted and passionate nature than Janáček's. In truth, until the public felt its heart-beat accelerated by the stimulating realism of *Její Pastorkyňa* (*Her Stepdaughter*) it was disposed to regard Janáček as a crank; in spite of the warning flashes given off from time to time in such choral works as *Maryčka Magdonova* and other settings of fierce poems by the labour-poet, Bezruč. Real creative fire slumbered under the ashes of public neglect and misunderstanding. Even

Kovařovic, conductor-in-chief at the Národní Divadlo, felt rather like a civilian with a bomb thrust into his hands, when presented with the manuscript of *Pastorkyňa*. He gave it his willing co-operation in the end, and fully acknowledged its originality and emotional power; so that it did not long puzzle the Prague musical public, but awakened them to the knowledge that they possessed in Janáček a new and unclassable musical genius. Here was a folk-opera, the purpose of which was neither a display of local costumes, nor the exploitation of attractive folk-melodies, but a revelation of human character reflected in the individual temperaments of the race with which the musician was most familiar. Not merely the folk-material, but the stuff of all life is in Janáček's operas.

He says, in one of his articles, that in noting hundreds of authentic fragments of melodic speech, heard in his every-day surroundings, he does not use them in his composition. This is an ambiguous statement. Probably he really means that he does not use them without due selection and added craftsmanship; otherwise his music would be—what so much of to-day's music actually is—a mere succession of unrelated phrases, a mosaic of things overheard. But to me it seems that all these ejaculations noted in Janáček's sketch-books, all these whirling atoms of natural music, molten in the fervour of Janáček's genius, like "nebulae condensing to an orb," become welded into a compact, glowing organism, such as we find in each of his three complete and published operas: *Její Pastorkyňa* (*Her Stepdaughter*), *Výlety Páně Broučkovy* (*The Excursions of Mr. Brouček*), and, above all, in that latest and most convincing tragic opera, *Katya Kabanova* (*Kate Kabanov*). In these works we have not "a new music," because the expression is as meaningless as the phrase "a new religion," but a new aspect of music, a fresh illumination thrown upon the dark horizon-line of its limitations; such light as is only flashed from the beacon towers of genius. These are big words, but I am persuaded that time will justify them. Janáček's operas are stepping over the frontiers of Czechoslovakia. *Pastorkyňa* has been given in Vienna and Cologne; *Kate Kabanov* will be heard in Frankfurt.

Janáček's reputation was actually made by the production of *Její Pastorkyňa* (*Her Stepdaughter*; in the German edition entitled *Jenufa*) in 1916. I see his three masterpieces, each so entirely different from the other—for Janáček never repeats himself even in the hope of following up a popular success—as one might see three differently coloured and cut gems in one

setting. *Pastorkyňa*, that drama of peasant love and crime and false respectability, glows with passionate colour, deep, incarnadine as the heart of a fine Bohemian garnet; *The Excursions of Mr. Brouček*, by no means a transparent jewel, a little clouded and motley, may be compared to an opal in its harlequin play of many-tinted humour; *Kate Kabanov* is a dark, tragic, light-absorbing amethyst.

Jeji Pastorkyňa is based on a tale of Moravian village life by Gabriella Preissova, which is saved from being sordid by the element of an all-forgiving, generous love, exemplified in the hero Laca. Two young men, half-brothers, love Jenufa, who lives with her stepmother, a highly respectable woman who is the caretaker of the village church. Jenufa is infatuated with Steva, a handsome ne'er-do-weel. When the stepmother finds that Steva has ruined Jenufa's life, this proud self-righteous woman goes on her knees before the graceless village Lothario and implores him to marry the girl. Steva is sheepish, but obdurate. In spite of her weakness where he was concerned, he has caught a glimpse of something austere and earnest in Jenufa's nature that alarms him; besides, it is now too late, for he is engaged to the Mayor's daughter. The idea of a scandal in her family unhinges the stepmother's mind and morals. To hide a sin she commits a worse one. While Jenufa is asleep she puts the unwanted baby into the frozen mill-stream. Her words as she carries the child out of the cottage, unknown to the half-delirious mother, show the fanatical side of her nature. Also we are subtly made aware that no real mother would have acted thus. As the months pass, Jenufa yields indifferently to Laca's persuasions and they are betrothed. The thawing of the mill-stream reveals the crime. With all Janáček's naturalism, he does not show the crime itself on the stage, but only the harrowing mental and spiritual consequences. An angry crowd of villagers attack the wretched, bewildered Jenufa, but Laca keeps them at bay. At last the stepmother confesses that she is the culprit. Jenufa is broken-hearted at the fate of her child, and for the sorrow this scandal has brought upon the devoted, but unloved Laca. But her heart is infinitely good: "God comfort you," she says to the wretched stepmother, who, forgiven, follows the Mayor to judgment. Jenufa then bids Laca leave her to face her ruined life alone. But Laca makes it plain to her that his only chance of happiness lies in sharing her burden. So, in an atmosphere of pity and reconciliation and quietly dawning hope—an atmosphere as mellow as that which pervades the last Act of a late

Shakespearian drama—this remarkable opera comes to an end. The music of *Jeji Pastorkyňa*, though strongly tintured with the folk spirit, is, in substance, a strikingly original creation. Janáček makes use of a style of melodic recitative which is said to be specifically Slovak-Moravian in rhythm and accent. What really matters for us foreigners is that—as in the case of Mussorgsky's unmistakably Russian melodic recitative—it is a method of expression admirably adapted to the utterance of varied and poignant emotion. The vocal phrases, whether they follow each other continuously or are broken by pregnant pauses, whether they are urgent with elemental passion or languid with sorrow, tense or all but quiescent, seem perfectly natural in effect. The disadvantage of the strongly localised accent and lilt need trouble only the unfortunate translators of the text.

Rhythmically, *Jeji Pastorkyňa* contains many interesting pages: not merely as regards the skilful weaving of various measures into a complex and supple rhythmic tissue, but because of what—for want of a better verbal equivalent—I must describe as its *emotional rhythm*.

The orchestration has a colour and tang of its own. It owes nothing to the Russian, or any other, school of instrumentation. Sometimes there are effects which consciously aim at the imitation of local instruments used by the people—such as the *dudy*, a small bagpipe, the *fujara* or pastoral flute, or the cymbal: but the chief object of Janáček's orchestration is to enforce, and comment upon, psychological situations, not to paint tone-pictures.

When, in 1916, *Pastorkyňa* astonished, and finally conquered, the musical world of Czechoslovakia, Janáček had already finished the first part of *The Excursions of Mr. Brouček*, and it was probably in the flush of his first success that he decided to set the second half of Svatopluk Čech's fantastic satire, and early in 1918 the whole work was complete and presented to the Directorate of the Národní Divadlo. In the householder Mr. Brouček, Čech conceived the portrait of an average Czech Philistine of pre-war days—a superficial patriot, a materialistic opportunist, fond of his beer and his sausages—a character whom Janáček more than once compares with Goncharov's Oblomov. We first meet Mr. Brouček outside the ancient inn, called the "Vikarka," in the precincts of the Hradčany, or Castle, of Prague. The orchestral Introduction is built on the theme of the old inn: the slightly atmospheric and capricious motive of the

moon, and a calm broad *cantilena* depicting the earth lying in bright moonlight. These in their turn engender other well-defined themes; for in this opera Janáček not only weaves a tissue of short motives of melodic speech, but makes a more definite use of developed and extended themes, to recall certain places and incidents from time to time: "leading motives," in fact, which stand out in relief upon this fabric of threadlike and shifting ejaculatory themelets. When the curtain rises we see the Vikarka, the house of the Sacristan, against the wall of St. Vitus's Cathedral, and also a pair of squabbling lovers: Málinka, the Sacristan's daughter, and the down-at-heels artist Mazal. The Inn is a favourite resort of the artists of the town, and we hear fragments of their songs through the open windows. Brouček appears in "a rosy mood," as the lovers call it: in reality very full of beer and rather irritable. He is easily drawn into fatuous, boastful arguments. One of his pet subjects is that the moon is inhabited and that a householder might be free from all the minor worries of terrestrial existence if he went there. A little later we see him staggering up the Castle steps, where he falls into a doze. The voice of the potboy of the Vikarka is heard calling from time to time "Mr. Brouček, you've forgotten your sausages," and also the phrase customary to Würfl, the landlord of the Inn: "We shall be pleased if you call again soon." But Brouček has passed into a kind of trance, the music indicates his transmigration to a new atmosphere, and presently the stage, which has been wrapped in white mists, shows us the Land of the Moon, and a fantastic castle in the background, with Mr. Brouček still asleep on a cloud.

Of course the same kind of people live in the moon—under different physical conditions—as on earth. Blankytňy, who now approaches on Pegasus, is no other than the artist Mazal who tormented Brouček outside the Vikarka. His offended sweetheart Málinka, whom the bemused Brouček consoled by promising to take her to the Moon, is now transformed into Etherea, and possessed by a wild passion for Brouček. Her father, the Sacristan, is called Lunobor—a tiresome old embodiment of empty learning who goes about armed with a huge manuscript and an enormous green butterfly net. From the former he reads aloud his æsthetic theories to the bored and uncomprehending Brouček; in the latter he catches and imprisons his daughter, Etherea, when her advances to Brouček become too pronounced. The potboy of the Vikarka becomes the wonder-child who serves at the banqueting hall of Čarovouci; the former

landlord of the Vikarka, is now changed into a kind of Mæcenas of the Moon, who presides over the star-shaped temple of All the Arts, and encourages the various groups of artists who live and work in its separate rays. The themes used on earth reappear in the Moon, sometimes with skilful modifications. The curious white, luminous atmosphere of the scenery is reflected in the music. While in Janáček's *Pastorkyňa* the special melodic curves of speech which he uses are those of love, anguish, and tender reconciliation, in *The Excursion to the Moon* the curves most insisted upon are those of irony and sarcasm. It would be impossible to follow in detail all the intricate musical psychology of this part of Mr. Brouček's excursions. There is a wide range of humour, from biting satire to broad farce. Some of it we can hardly appreciate without a very intimate knowledge of Czech history, literature and social life. But anyone who cares to procure a pianoforte score of *Výlety Páne Broučkovy* (published in the Universal Edition, Vienna) will certainly get a good deal of fun for his money. The absurd adventures of the hungry Mr. Brouček at the banquet table, where the Moon-dwellers regale themselves on the perfumes of the Moonflowers and bottled tears; the passionate love songs of Etherea (Čech may have had the love scenes between Titania and Bottom in his mind when he wrote these verses); Brouček's frantic efforts to free himself from her endearments; the vanity of the Art-patron Čarovouci; the surprise of the Moon-dwellers when they catch the exhausted Brouček munching a sausage found in his pocket, and believe, from the contortions of his face, that "he is weeping"; their horror when Brouček brusquely announces: "I'm not crying, I'm eating"; their squeals of disgust when he adds "meat"; Brouček's final flight upon Pegasus from the importunate Etherea—all these things can be enjoyed without troubling ourselves about every side-reference to national events, or without any attempt to sift out the Czech and Slovak musical elements which give a characteristic flavour to the whole. As the exasperated Brouček, who has had quite enough of the tenuous dietary and rarefied atmosphere of the lunar world, descends on Pegasus to solid earth, mists again cover the stage, while the earth theme is heard, and we see the stars, in a great expanse of sky, slowly whitening as dawn breaks; one star gives out a red glow. Gradually the Vikarka and its surroundings loom out of the half-light; the red star becomes the lamp of the Inn; on the doorstep Würfl, the host, bids good-bye to his late revellers; the final chorus of the Artists in the Moon changes

to the chorus of earthly Artists; Mazal and Málinka are seen wandering in close embrace; the potboy hastens down the Castle steps crying: "Here is Mr. Brouček, in a cask!" Day has come, the red light is extinguished; Mazal and Málinka sing the last lines of their love duet "Dawn is Near," and with long-drawn chords of B flat and A major, the curtain falls.

The second part of Mr. Brouček's adventures, *The Excursion to the XVth Century*, although it is linked psychologically, and here and there musically, with the *Excursion to the Moon*, is very different in feeling from the almost extravaganza nonsense of the first picture of this diptych. The light, if mordant, satire of the Moon-land adventure, becomes altogether more weighty and logical, even from the first bars of the orchestral Prelude with its rather tempestuous evocation of a troublous past. The curtain rises upon the underground treasure-house of King Wenceslaus IV.; its walls studded with gold and priceless gems, and on the inlaid floor piles of arms, gold and silver helmets, belts, broideries—and the riches of an Arabian Nights' tale. On one wall hangs a full length portrait of the King. Voices are heard from above. The experiences of the Moon have not cured Mr. Brouček of his beer-drinking habits, nor subdued his argumentative boastfulness when in his cups. Though invisible, he is evidently engaged in trying to prove to his companions, especially to Würfl the inn-keeper, and a professor who frequents the Vikarka, the existence of a subterranean passage that leads to the treasure-house. Presently we are told he falls into a big barrel and we hear his muffled cries for help, while a series of descending chromatic scales announces his rapid descent—somewhere. Then a lock grates as a secret door opens, the portrait of King Wenceslaus slews round and Brouček steps into the treasury—and also into the XVth century. He looks round the place, lights a lustre suspended from above, and after a time searches for an exit. He finds one behind the picture, disclosing as he goes a view of the Market Place in the Old City. When he has gone out, leaving the place in darkness, save for the weird greenish light reflected from the gem-lined walls, the spirit of Svatopluk Čech, the author of the work, appears. In a strong, broad cantilena over an undulating accompaniment, he speaks of the victory of the Czech cause which is approaching. The dominating theme which lends itself to a heroic climax, becomes, later in the work, the motive of Žižka's great victory. Yet the poet ends with a sigh, knowing that freedom is not yet. The apparition vanishes, and as the inner curtain goes up, the

Old Market Place is shown in the flush of dawn, with Brouček at the street corner, as yet unconscious that he is in the XVth century, and roundly abusing "the powers that be" for the state of the streets, the poorness of the lamps, etc. He sees a man in the dress of the period and is puzzled. This Town Councillor interrogates Brouček and takes him for one of Sigmund's spies. For a true and courageous patriot this stern and crucial hour in Bohemian history might have been full of heroic inspiration; for a sham patriot of the soft and selfish type of our Mr. Brouček it was full of terrifying experiences. He evades them for the moment by explaining that he is a stranger "just arrived from Turkey," hence the peculiarities of his speech and dress. The characters are the same as those in the introduction and in the Moon, now in their second metempsychosis. Mazal, the painter, becomes Petřík; Málinka (Etherea) becomes Kunka, daughter of Domšík od Zvonu, formerly the Sacristan. Mine host Würfl becomes the Town Councillor; the Wonder-child, once the Potboy, is an impertinent student, and so on. It would be impossible to follow Mr. Brouček through all his adventures. Very shortly we hear the approaching force of armed people marching, with the pipers at their head. As Domšík says, "the day of the Lord is at hand." They march to the famous Tyn Church, once the scene of Huss's ministrations. The music is based on two themes: one is a warning to the enemies of true patriotism (we heard it warning Brouček as he rolled down in the cask to the depths of the past); the other is the bagpipe tune. In this way the first act comes to a brilliant close.

In Act II. Brouček is taken in by the Domšík od Zvonu, who gives him suitable, but very uncomfortable, XV. century clothes. We see him, after an orchestral prelude, seated on the side of an old four-poster in the Domšík's house, waking from sleep and realising at last his change of circumstances. The music of the orchestral section is built on a spirited theme, which swings into a lively valse rhythm as Brouček drops into the mood (as he thinks) of the XVth century. But, alas, he soon finds himself in the strenuous atmosphere of religious controversy. His assertion that Sigismund and his Catholic soldiers, or Žižka and his Hussite warriors are all the same to him, does not go down in that positive age. He manages to trim for a time, but when weapons are put into his hands, at the news that Prague is attacked, and he is bidden to go and fight for Žižka's cause, he slinks away and manages to get back into his old clothes. For the moment every one, including Domšík's daughter Kunka

(once the enamoured Etherea, but now instinctively revengeful), is too busy fighting to notice Brouček; but presently the news of victory is shouted off the stage, and, to the accompaniment of the symbolic theme of warning and victory, the scene changes and we see once more the Market Place, now flooded by the rays of sunset, and Žižka, with his Taborite warriors, returning from the victorious battle of Vitkov. Petřík gravely intones the old Hussite war hymn, and a stirring climax is built up. Brouček, when discovered in the arcade of the Domšík's house by two Taborite soldiers, tells them a wonderful tale of his prowess in the deliverance of Prague. Unfortunately, he is overheard by Petřík, who says he has seen the traitor on his knees before the German knights praying for mercy. The people now begin to suspect Brouček, and with cries of "Antichrist" demand his conviction. He is sentenced to be burnt at the stake. In vain he implores the pity of the ruthless crowd, excusing himself as "not being one of them," a man born elsewhere, in another age; at a wild *crescendo* of the traitor-motive he is pushed along in a barrel to meet his doom. During an orchestral interlude on characteristic themes, the back curtain is lowered and behind it we see the glow of flames and hear the noise of the crowd. Then the light dies down until only one small flame remains—a candle in the hand of mine host Würfl. Here, as in the Moon, the transition from dreams to reality is most skilfully followed by the music. The traitor-theme passes through several modifications, then comes a surprising reference to the Moon hymn ("the Moon is our Home") which wickedly parodies the Czech national Hymn, and then the semi-transparent curtain is drawn up, to an accompaniment of Brouček's sighs and groans, and reveals him in the barrel, with Würfl standing over him, candle in hand. Würfl awakens the sleeper from his nightmare and the incorrigible Mr. Brouček soon unfolds to him his wonderful adventures. We hear the fine Hussite march-theme once more as he relates how "he thrashed Sigismund's Crusaders" and set Prague free; how he saw Žižka and his warriors and was the hero of the hour. The leading motive of Hussite victory is heard once more, rapidly giving place to a version of the traitor theme, just as Brouček whispers emphatically and cautiously to Würfl: "But, mind you don't say a word to anyone!" After which they both walk off and the curtain descends.

Musically this work is as valuable as either of Janáček's other operas. There are delightful musical moments in the first half, and really great and salient pages in the second part

It has, however, one serious fault which, in spite of its great musical merits, may for some time to come alienate the sympathy of its own people. As a satire *Mr. Brouček's Excursion to the XVth Century* has lost its point. The war, has shown us that the Brouček type, the outcome of political slavery and enforced spiritual indolence, is practically extinct; but the time when it existed is not yet remote enough for its antics to provoke a hearty laugh in Czechoslovakia.

After hearing *Její Pastorkyňa* it seemed that it was impossible to go further in opera in the direction of organic unity and emotional concentration. But in *Katya Kabanova* Janáček has performed a miracle of dramatic and musical condensation. This is partly because the sombre, tragic lights in which the plot is enveloped are focussed almost entirely on the central figure of the work. The story of *Katya Kabanova*, familiar to all students of Russian literature who have read Ostrovsky's great drama *Burya* (*The Storm*), is a tragedy of every-day life played out amid the spacious scenery of the Volga. In the narrow spiritual enclosure of her mother-in-law's house, Kate Kabanov dwells body and soul a prisoner; while outside, the shimmering, shoreless waters of the Volga speak of unlimited freedom. The voice of the river in eternal movement, deep, fateful, heedless of the petty human drama enacting on its banks, yet promising a refuge at the last, pervades the whole opera.

The period of the tale is the Sixties of last century, when in provincial Russia the old harsh views as to the authority of the old over the young still held sway. The psychological web of the story is revealed in a dialogue between two of the characters as they are looking at the frescoes on an old arch.

"Ivan the Terrible—he knew how to rule." "Yes, as we understand it in Russia. And he has plenty of descendants. Certainly. Especially in family life."

Such spiritual descendants of Ivan the Terrible are the Merchant, Savel Dikoy, and Martha Kabanova, widow of a wealthy merchant. Each tyrant has an individual victim, Dikoy's nephew, Boris, brought up in a cultured and aristocratic atmosphere, is compelled by the circumstances of a deferred coming-of-age to live with this half-tipsy despot, his guardian, and endure his coarse abuse. Widow Kabanova finds in her daughter-in-law, Kate, an ever-ready prey for her catlike, venomous nature. Both the old people are very religious in a stupid, superstitious way. Widow Kabanova tortures the fine feelings of Kate and simultaneously crosses herself before

the ikons. The unhappy Boris falls in love with Kate, but she is still attached to her husband, and the young married couple might have been fairly happy but for the mother's tyrannical jealousy, working like a poison in their lives.

Kate is no ordinary woman: she has had a happy and gentle upbringing; she is proud, refined, and subject to moods of religious exaltation that suggest a highly-strung but not too well-balanced nature. She yearns for more than she can find in her weak, good-looking young merchant husband, who goes in dread of his mother. Her sole confidant is Varvara, a *protégée* of Widow Kabanova, who lives in the house with them. Varvara is carrying on a secret love intrigue with Kudryash, a young professor of chemistry. A crisis comes when Widow Kabanova insists on her son going to Moscow on business. Kate's almost hysterical harping that some catastrophe will certainly happen if he leaves her alone with her mother-in-law, ends by irritating Tikhon, and he leaves his wife hurriedly and in anger. While Kate is feeling herself completely abandoned to Widow Kabanova's unkindness, and her own disturbed thoughts, temptation comes through Varvara. The stringent condensation of the libretto leaves some doubt as to Kate's feelings for Boris when she takes the key of the garden from Varvara and consents to meet him at night. Her passionate desire not to be separated from her husband and her forebodings of catastrophe, seem to argue that she already realises that her fate is in the hands of her fellow victim, Boris. Yet she deceives her own heart when she goes to this secret assignation. "What harm in a few words with this man as unhappy as herself?"

The love scene in the garden of the Kabanov house is one of the least conventional and most convincing love scenes ever staged in opera. Two love interests are carried on alternately, offering the strongest possible psychological contrast. The love of Varvara and Kudryash is full-blooded, gay, impermanent, conscienceless. In the grey dusk of the evening, the young professor waits at the foot of the stone steps leading to the house. To pass the time away till Varvara comes he sings a Russian song, pointedly rhythmic, to a thrumming *balalayka* accompaniment. Boris comes in and speaks of his passion for Kate. In spite of his light-hearted philosophy of life and love, Kudryash is alarmed for the young wife and warns Boris. Then Varvara's voice is heard in the distance. She and Kudryash answer each other in a delightful duet in the Russian folk-style, and then trip off gaily to the riverside.

The poignant, yearning, apprehensive love scene of Kate and Boris then follows. With her sensitive conscience she realises her feelings as sinful. But passion, fatal and strong as the flow of the Volga, breaks down her resistance. She gives herself with complete self-abandonment, but without joy. Musically this scene is the highest achievement in all Janáček's operatic works.

Act III. shows us a terrace by the Volga, a lurid sunset, and a group of people expectant of the storm (from which Ostrovsky's play takes its title). The storm variously affects the destinies of the chief protagonists. Each individual responds to it according to his or her temperament. To Kudryash, lightning is just an electric current that may be diverted by a lightning-conductor; to Dikoy and Widow Kabanova it is an instrument of Divine wrath for the punishment of sinners, who do not, of course, include themselves. On Kate the effect is to some extent spiritual. Her highly-strung nerves are racked by the tempest, and the frequent reiteration by the bystanders (we are never allowed to forget that we are among Russians) of such phrases as "the judgment of God" unnerves her still more. When Boris appears on the scene at the height of the storm, Kate completely loses her self-control, and, dropping on her knees, confesses her guilt aloud. Then she falls unconscious into her husband's arms. Tikhon is moved to pity rather than anger—for once he has no ears for his mother's words: "Son, what did I tell you?" Suddenly Kate recovers consciousness, remembers what she has done and, breaking from her husband's embrace, rushes distraught into the night. In the next scene Tikhon and the servant maid are searching for Kate by lantern light. Varvara and Kudryash flit across the stage. She is telling her lover that life with the tyrannical old widow will now be impossible. "How shall I live?" she asks. And Kudryash answers casually: "Live? Why, come with me, of course!" And so, cheerfully with no pangs of conscience these light o' loves make off to "Mother Moscow." Kate now comes upon the empty stage. In a monologue she reveals her mental and moral derangement. She feels only a blind longing for Boris. While she sings, a wordless chorus is heard, distant and unearthly. It is the voice of the Volga which plays so fatalistic a part in the opera. At last Boris appears. There is a moment of culminating poignancy. Kate begs forgiveness for her betrayal; he tells her that he must now go and hide his disgrace with a friend in Siberia. Kate tries pathetically to remember something important she wants

to tell him. At last it comes to her, like a phrase from Dostoyevsky : " Promise, whenever a beggar asks alms, to give them for my sake." The voice of the Volga accompanies their last agonies of farewell. When Kate is alone she goes nearer to the water. Only one thing now seems lovely and peaceful—death. She seeks it in the river. Voices give the alarm, and people rush in with lanterns. Old Dikoy unchains a boat. Tikhon would follow, but his mother holds him back. A brief dialogue between mother and son. A bitter reproach from Tikhon ; an imperious retort from Widow Kabanova, whose heart is in nowise touched by the event ; and then Dikoy reappears carrying the lifeless body of Kate. Tikhon flings himself upon the corpse, while the crowd stares down stupidly and pityingly upon her. As the curtain slowly descends upon the group, the wordless chorus swells to a majestic volume. Volga rolls on, unmoved, triumphant.

I have dwelt long—too long, perhaps—upon the literary side of *Katya Kabanova*, but Janáček's music is so integral a part of his libretto that it is almost impossible to separate them for analytical purposes. And to be perfectly honest, the music is so unlike any that I have ever heard before that I find it difficult to say more than this : that it fits the words perfectly—or rather that it is one with the text. Like *Její Pastorkyňa*, the opera opens with a Prelude, which, again, is not so much a thematic exposition as preparation of the mind and emotions for what is to follow. Early in this introduction there is a startling fateful drum-figure heard against the muted trombones which sounds like a rhythm of destiny ; and the wood-wind gives out melancholy wailing phrases between the two repetitions of this figure ; but we soon go on to a rushing *Allegro* in which, however, the drum figure is not lost sight of. The orchestral treatment is very original. The oboe and clarinet are particularly well suited to express the kind of speaking, melodic fragments which make up Janáček's musical fabric, and he uses them freely. He uses also the *viola d'amore* with its " sweet seraphic tones," as Berlioz described them. But I am speaking chiefly from memory, because the full score of *Katya Kabanova* was not available when I heard it, being still in the printers' hands. Another orchestral interlude precedes the love scene : its changes of measure are characteristically swift and subtle.

As in *Její Pastorkyňa*, Janáček has caught the melodic accent of the Slovak tongue, so in *Katya Kabanova* he reproduces with extraordinary fidelity the lilt and inflections of the Russian

speech. At the close of Act II., for instance, in a little scene between Dikoy, who is rather tipsy, and Widow Kabanova, I found myself transported to the village streets, or to some small inn or tea shop in a Russian provincial town.

But the real secret of this opera's greatness lies in its concentrated emotional power. Our eyes and ears are riveted from first to last upon the suffering figure of "Kate." If in *Její Pastorkyňa* Janáček has found the motives and melodic curves of virile passion, pardon, unselfish love, egotistical respectability, and maternal tenderness, and gives us an opera with much of the thrill and glow of Elisabethan tragedy—in *Katya Kabanova* he moulds the melodic curves of aspiration and spiritual exaltation, of fatal foreboding, of cruelty, dignity, and madness into a work the truthfulness of which is burnt into us as we listen. *Kate Kabanov* is as strong, as irreversible, as absolute in effect as an antique tragedy.

ROSA NEWMARCH.

THE MONTHS BEFORE THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION.

[These are notes written by a Russian Conservative, clever, patriotic, and enlightened, a distinguished member of the Second, Third, and Fourth Dumas, who took an active part both in the Red Cross work at the Front and in the munitioning work in Petrograd.]

It is true more than a year had gone by, and as yet there had been no revolution. The vexation caused in Russia by the terrible retreat of 1915 had indeed been successfully diverted into a safety-valve, namely, the Imperial Duma. The effervescence of revolutionary energy had been successfully drawn off into words, into ardent speeches and well-turned and high-sounding orders of the day. For revolutions—that is, for bloodshed and destruction—we had managed to substitute resolutions, that is, verbal condemnation of the Government.

We had managed to do more than that. On the basis of these “severe” reprimands made in public, we had managed to maintain our unity with the Government in the most important question—the war. Throughout we had contrived to keep firmly fixed on the dome of the Tauris Palace our big motto: “All for the war.” However much our “bronze horseman”¹ might call the Progressive Bloc² the Yellow Bloc, it was not true. It was a tricolor Bloc, the white, blue, and red, the national flag of Russia. But . . . but is not the red stripe of this tricolor now beginning to take more than its share and to overflow the other colours? In moments of doubt, I sometimes begin to think that, from firemen trying to stifle a revolution, we shall involuntary become its incendiaries. We are too eloquent; we are too talented in our oratorical exercises. We

¹ Mr. Markov, principal spokesman of the small reactionary group, so called from his remarkable likeness to portraits of Peter the Great. *The Bronze Horseman* is the title of a poem by Pushkin on Peter's statue in Petrograd.—ED.

² The Progressive Bloc, containing the majority and most of the best brains in the Duma, was formed in 1915. It included many of the Nationalists, with the Octobrists, the Cadets, and the Progressists (or Radicals).—ED.

are too easily believed when we say that the Government is good for nothing.

Alas ! alas ! Why, the whole trouble is that that is the real truth—the Government is really good for nothing !

As far as mere technique is concerned—well, it might pass. Of course, we are far behind England and France. Thanks to our backwardness, the huge Russian Army is holding a far smaller enemy force than our numbers should warrant. They reported to us lately at the Special Conference¹ that in France there is one soldier in the rear for every two at the front. With us, on the contrary, there are two in the rear for every one at the front—that is four times as many. Thus the number of fighting men in Russia, with a population of one hundred and seventy millions, is not much more than the number in France with forty millions. This does not prevent us from suffering the cruellest losses. By the German reckoning, Russia has lost up till now eight millions of killed, wounded and prisoners. At this price we have accounted for four million enemies.

This terrible debit and credit account—every enemy placed *hors de combat* costs us two Russians—shows how freely we are squandering our Russian cannon-fodder. This alone is enough to condemn the Government. It condemns it in the present and in the past. It condemns us all, the whole ruling class and all the rest of us : our whole educated class, which has lived from day to day without thinking how hopelessly Russia is behind her neighbours in material civilisation. For the fact that we only knew how “to dance and sing, write verses and throw bombs,” we are now paying in millions of Russian lives, lives which could have been saved. We refused to be “Edisons” ; we could not have been if we had wished. We despised material civilisation. We found it much more interesting to make a “world literature,” a transcendental ballet and anarchical theories for which we now have to pay.

“Sang your ditty? Lor’, how pretty !
Now you’re free to dance out there !”²

And here we are, dancing the last thing in tango, on the top of trenches covered with corpses.

Happily the country does not know this terrible debit account—two Russians for one German. So this, the heaviest

¹ A Government Commission on munitions, in which leading members of the Duma took part.—ED.

² Quotation from the well-known Fable of Krylov : *Gadfly and Ant*. See p. 437.—ED.

guilt of Russia's history, is not yet brought home to the Government. Those who know this account, keep silence. Otherwise we should be attacking the Army, and the Army is at present shielded from all attacks. On the mistakes of the Staff and the incompetence of some of the generals, the political leaders keep silence.

* * * * *

But was it not right to treat the Government in this way—to shut our eyes to everything, as long as it went on with the war to the end?

If it was right, anyhow it was impossible. When we met in Petrograd in 1915, we had no choice. Everyone was so exasperated that the Imperial Duma had to "brand the authors of the nation's catastrophe," if it wanted its appeal for fresh victims and fresh enthusiasm to be taken up by the Army and the country. Between the Duma and the Army there had come to be a tacit understanding :

DUMA : We are giving it "them," but please don't do that yourselves ! Fight the Germans.

ARMY : Yes, we will go on fighting if you will go on rating "them " properly.

* * * * *

So we rate them. Isn't it time we stopped? But the trouble is that we cannot possibly stop. The war failures, the tension which is getting too much for us, the general exhaustion, which is plainly developing into a refusal to go on with the war—all this calls for the most careful home policy. And their home policy ! . . . Why they do it, God only knows ! You really cannot ask for endless sacrifices from the country and at the same time not take a half-penny's notice of it. You can afford not to take notice when you are winning. Winners are, of course, above criticism ; but losers are judged, and judged not only strictly but with extreme injustice, for it has been written : "væ victis." We have got to recognise this unjust law—"woe to the conquered." We have got to see that this injustice is inevitable, and act accordingly. We have got to act so as to satisfy not only the just court but the unjust. We have got to bribe our accusers, for they have the power to accuse us, since for every accuser there are millions of eager listeners, millions that think the same—no, not the same, but much worse. Yes, there are millions of them, because war failures are among those facts which need no propaganda. "A good name goes to sleep

on the stove, but a bad one runs about all over the world." For defeats you have to pay. Pay what? Why, the accepted price. Pay by resigning the power, even if it was only a seeming, a temporary power.

* * * * *

Our educated class calls out with the voice of the Duma :— You are ruining us. You are losing the war. Your Ministers are either fools or traitors. The country does not trust you. The Army does not trust you. Leave it to us. Let us have a try.

Say all that is untrue except for one thing—that the Germans are beating us. Anyhow, that can't be denied ; and if that is true, it is quite enough to ensure Russia giving an intelligent answer.

* * * * *

There are various things which might be done :—

(1) Call in the Progressive Bloc, which in other words means the Cadets, and let them form a Cabinet. Here ! Have a try ! See if you can govern !

What would happen then, Heaven knows ! Of course, the Cadets would not do miracles, but perhaps they could anyhow gain time. While people were finding out that the Cadets cannot do miracles, some months would go by, and then we should have reached the spring, with an offensive which would anyhow settle the whole question : If we win we swim, and if we lose it won't matter, because we shall all be drowned.

(2) If they won't surrender the power, then they will have to discover a second Stolypin, find a man whose mind and will would carry the country. He will have to say, like his prototype : " You can't frighten me," demonstratively dissolve the Duma, and rule himself, autocratically, not in words but in fact.

(3) If you don't call in the Cadets and can't find a second Stolypin, there is only one other course : end the war !

Outside these three plans there is no way—that is, no way with any sense in it. And what do they do instead ? They don't call in the Cadets, they don't dissolve the Duma, they don't look for a Stolypin, they don't conclude peace. Then what is there that they *do* do ? They appoint to the place of Stolypin—Stürmer !¹ What Petersburg says of Stürmer is :

¹ Stürmer had served as Governor of Yaroslav and later as a Master of Ceremonies at Court. His name was best known to the public in connection with large defalcations. He was supposed to have German sympathies. He was appointed first, Prime Minister, and later, also Foreign Minister in the place of that warm friend of Britain, Sazonov.

No principles at all, and a complete nonentity. To look at him, you would call him Father Christmas. But this Father Christmas will not bring Russia order for his Christmas present; on the contrary, he will sneak away the last prestige of the Government. Besides, this is a Father Christmas with a German name.

* * * * *

Of course, spy mania is a disgusting and incredibly stupid epidemic. Personally I don't believe in "treasons," and as for the "fight with German penetration,"¹ I think it a foolish and dangerous occupation. I have stood out against it, and have even pointed out in the Press that "when you light a Bickford fuse you had better remember what there is at the other end." I meant to say that one cannot regard every German in Russia as a spy simply because he is a German, bearing in mind Alice of Hessen, who happens to be our Empress. I was quite well understood, but all the same *Novoe Vremya* and all the rest of them were furious with me.

That's all very well; but still one has to take account of it, when everyone has gone mad on the subject and the last failures on the front are explained by the German names of some of our generals. It is intolerably stupid, but then all revolutions at all times had some utterly idiotic idea at the bottom. Treason! The terrible word is everywhere in the Army and in the rear. It began with Myasoyedov in 1914,² and now anyone is accused. This word goes right up to the top; volunteer female detectives even dance round the Court. As if not enough harm had been done to Russia by carelessness, that we must yet accuse someone of treason. And it is absolutely like an epidemic. People who, you would think, had some sense in them, play at it, too. This question nearly split the Bloc. Anyhow, one heard an unpleasant crack.

This was a few days ago. We were drawing up an "order of the day" on the new summons of the Imperial Duma. This

His appointment was followed by a gross attack in a reactionary paper on King George, for which the British Ambassador demanded and obtained a public apology. Hissed in the Duma, Stürmer did not visit it again and ultimately resigned. The two names, Stolypin and Stürmer, might suggest another fable of Krylov: *see* p. 438.—ED.

¹ Literally "the fight with German domination," meaning the eradication of excessive German economic influence in Russia; this was one of the catch-words of the first years of the war.—ED.

² Colonel Myasoyedov, one of the highest Intelligence officers of the Russian army, who was found guilty of espionage and hanged after the battle of Tannenberg.—ED.

had become a habit. It was usual for these "orders of the day" to have three parts: a greeting to the Allies, an appeal to the Army to go steadily on with the war, and a sharp criticism of the Government. As usual we met in room No. 11. It was a gloomy Petersburg morning, with electric light. On the green baize tables the lamps, with their dark shades, shed a pleasant light. Milyukov, Shingarev, Shidlovsky,¹ Kapnist II.,² Skoropadsky, Lvov II., Polovtsev II., and myself. Shidlovsky was in the chair. Someone read the proposed order of the day. It contained the fatal word. The Government was accused of "treason."

Two different opinions stood out sharply.

Opinion No. 1.—I call your attention to the word 'treason.' This is a terrible weapon. If we put it into the resolution, the Duma will deal a deadly blow to the Government. Of course, if there really is treason, there could be no resolution sharp enough to express our attitude towards it. But for that, we need to be convinced that the treason exists. All the gossip on the subject is in the end only gossip. If anyone has any facts, I beg him to give them. Such a charge we cannot make with our eyes shut.

Opinion No. 2.—We have got to understand clearly that we are passing into a new phase. The Government has not listened to our warnings. It goes on with its mad policy, the policy of provoking the whole country—the country from which it continues to demand unheard-of sacrifices. More than that, by the appointment of Stürmer, the Government has thrown out a fresh challenge to Russia. This policy, together with our failures at the front, makes one expect the worst. If this is not treason, what is? How else can you describe this annulling of all the efforts of the Army by a systematic destruction of what is more important than guns and shell—the people's spirit, its will to win? If this is not treason, it is anyhow a whole series of acts, such as genuine traitors could not improve on, to help the Germans.

Opinion No. 1.—That's all very well! Still, it is not treason. If that is all there is to say for putting this word into our resolution, it is plain to me that there is no treason and that consequently we must carefully avoid this word.

¹ See p. 445.

² Where there were two Members of the same name in the Duma, the junior was styled in this way.—ED.

Opinion No. 2.—The word is in everyone's mouth. If we leave it out, we shall not be doing what is expected of us; and that would be the tactics of the ostrich. If the word is not uttered by the Imperial Duma, all the same it will still be in the mouth of everyone everywhere, in the Army and in the rear. But if we are so extremely conscientious as to hide our heads under our wings and keep quiet, there is something else which they will say, too. People will say: The Duma is afraid, the Duma dare not say the truth, the Duma has hushed up treason, the Duma itself has betrayed us. We shall not make any change in the public temper; we shall only bury ourselves after destroying all the bases of the State. The last authority which is still believed in, will collapse. It will be the end of confidence in the Imperial Duma. When that happens—and happen it certainly will if we don't express even in the mildest words what is agitating the whole country—then, what everyone is feeling and thinking, will find another outlet. It will go on to the streets and the squares. We have got to say this word, even if we don't want to. We have got to understand that just now we are in the position of a line of policemen holding back a crowd. Yes, we are holding it back, but there are limits to everything. It is no fault of ours that this intolerable situation goes on so long. The crowd is pushing us from behind. As we are pushed from behind, we, too, have got to move forward. Resist the pressure as hard as we can, we have still got to move forward. If we stop moving, they will sweep us away and break through, and the crowd will rush upon what we are all still defending—yes, flogging, abusing, and reproaching, but still defending—the authority of the State, not those who wield it but the authority itself. While we are speaking, people hate it but don't lay hands on it. As soon as we stop speaking, they will rush at it.

Opinion No. 1.—Our opinion is a perfectly clear one. You can't accuse anyone of treason, if you have not the facts. No arguments, however eloquent, will make us think otherwise. Besides that, to all these arguments we could oppose arguments which are no less convincing. For instance, as to the authority of the Imperial Duma, we shall lose it just at that moment when we allow ourselves to accuse people of treason without facts to prove it. Any authority founded on falsehood, on deceit or even on shallow catchwords will not last long. We refuse to go that way. We will only play at this game on one condition—cards on the table. Tell us your proofs of treason, or strike out that word.

Opinion No. 2.—Facts we have, but we cannot communicate them at present for reasons only too important.

Opinion No. 1.—In that case we stick to our view.

* * * * *

We went off to lunch with an ominous cracking of the Bloc, but after lunch we went on with the discussion.

Opinion No. 1.—If you want to repeat the tactics of 1905, we won't follow you.

Opinion No. 2.—What do you call the tactics of 1905?

Opinion No. 1.—Why, when you charged the Government with organising the Jewish pogroms, though you knew very well that pogroms come of themselves and have gone on coming as long as there were Jews, and that the Russian Government never organised Jewish pogroms.

Opinion No. 2.—To begin with, Plehve organised the Kishinev pogrom; and, secondly, where do you see the analogy?

Opinion No. 1.—The analogy is that you are carried away in the fight and want to hit the Government as hard as you can; so you accuse it of treason without having the proofs

Opinion No. 2.—Proofs exist.

Opinion No. 1.—Then give them.

Opinion No. 2.—We will give them in our speeches in the Duma.

In the end a compromise was adopted. We did put in the resolution the word " treason," but without charging the Government with treason. We said that the acts of the Government, incompetent, foolish, and something else, had brought us to this pass, that the fatal word of treason flies from mouth to mouth. That is true; it certainly does!

* * * * *

The day before yesterday, on the 1 November,¹ Milyukov made his speech, which has already become famous, both for itself and particularly because it has been forbidden by the censorship. He gave his " proofs of treason." The proofs were not very convincing. He makes you feel that Stürmer is surrounded by suspicious characters, but nothing more than that. But is that the point? The point is that Stürmer is a little insignificant person, and that Russia is engaged in a world war. The point is that all the Powers have put forward their best

¹ Old Style.—ED.

men, and we have a Father Christmas for a Prime Minister. That is the terrible thing, and that is what makes the country so furious. And who wants, who needs to make people furious? In fact it is as if they did it on purpose!

There is a certain General Shuvayev who is Minister of War. He is unquestionably a good and honourable man. If he were at the head of the Intendancy he would certainly be in his place, but as War Minister . . . Well, this is the story about him. He had heard, somehow or other, that someone or other had accused him of treason (though such an idea never really occurred to anyone). The old fellow was terribly hurt, and they say he kept walking to and fro, repeating: "Perhaps I am a fool, but I am not a traitor." Milyukov took this phrase as the refrain of his speech. He gave different instances of this or that stupidity, and then asked after each: "What is that, treason or stupidity?" And each time this stinging question was loudly applauded. Milyukov's speech was pretty rough, but strong. The point is that it was just in the present mood of Russia. If by some miracle one could get the whole country inside the White Hall of the Tauris Palace and Milyukov repeated his speech before this ocean of millions, the clapping which would follow it would drown the hottest fire of the "hundred and fifty parks of shell" which General Manikovsky was to get ready at the "order" of the Special Conference.¹

The Ministerial benches were empty!

They were empty again to-day when I had to go to my Golgotha, but the Duma was crowded. All parties were at full strength, the galleries densely thronged with people. I looked at the empty Ministerial benches. "Gentlemen of the Imperial Duma, you witnessed how, for several hours, this tribune re-echoed with the gravest charges against the Government: so grave that one might shudder to listen to them. But the terrible thing is not the charges. Charges there have been before. The terrible thing is that these charges remain unanswered. The terrible thing is that these benches are empty, that this Government cannot even find the strength to defend itself, that the Government has not even come down to this Hall, where openly before all Russia it is accused of treason. The terrible thing is that to these charges there is this answer." I pointed to the empty Ministerial benches.

¹ General Manikovsky, Chief of the Engineering Department and later Deputy Minister of War under the Provisional Government, had thus formulated his readiness to fulfil the wishes expressed on the Special Conference on Munitions.

And is it not true? In Latin, the legal phrase runs: "Silence does not give consent, but if anyone keeps silence when he is bound to speak, that means consent." That is just what has happened here. The Government was bound to speak when the matter had gone so far, and not only to speak but to answer. In a case like this, too, the answer cannot only be one of words. There are charges which are only answered by action; and this action had to be either the resignation of the Government or the dissolution of the Duma.

But if they do not dissolve the Duma and still the dishonoured Government with the blush of treason on its cheeks continues to govern, the only thing we can do is to scorch it with words till it goes, because when we stop talking the streets will begin. This was what I said: "And we will go on fighting this Government till it goes. Here we will say everything out, that outside the country may keep quiet. We will go on speaking, that the workmen in the factories may go on quietly working. Let them never stop making shells for the front, knowing that the Imperial Duma will say for them everything that must be said. We will go on speaking, that the Army in the trenches may go on facing the enemy at the front, and never look back at the rear. In the rear there is the Imperial Duma. It sees, it hears, it knows, and each time that it is wanted it will say its word."

Yes, and so—and so my speech will be hammered out by endless typists as forbidden literature. The Imperial Duma has done what was expected of it. It has shouted out angrily at the Government, and told it to go.

"Galleries thronged with rank and fashion,
Didn't I speak with fire and passion?"

But really, gentlemen! Haven't you anyone who can make you see sense? Why, you can't go on like that. You can't go on stirring up the people, the country, the masses who are shedding their blood unceasingly, ungrudgingly. Does not that blood have rights of its own? Have these silent victims no voice? Is it not all one, whether Stürmer is a traitor or not? If, whether rightly or wrongly, the country is wild for "men who deserve its confidence," why not try them? Why not appoint them? Suppose these men of "confidence" are not much good. Well, there is no Stolypin in sight just now. Suppose Milyukov is no good. Well, he is anyhow not worse than Stürmer. Why are you so obstinate? What in reason is the sense of it? What, indeed?

That is the trouble—that what is happening is something transcendently irrational! And besides, there is a something before which hands fall in impotence. You can always ruin yourself, if you choose. There is some horrible grub that is boring at the trunk of Russia. He has already eaten out the core, perhaps the trunk itself is gone already, and only the bark of the great tree, three hundred years old,¹ is still standing. And here is no remedy, here is no use fighting; it is this that is deadly. The name of this deadly thing is Rasputin.

Trans. B.P.

V. SHULGIN.

¹ The first of the Romanovs, Michael, came to the throne in 1613.
—ED.

AT THE FEAST OF THE GODS:

CONTEMPORARY DIALOGUES.¹

DRAMATIS PERSONÆ.

A PUBLIC MAN.

A GENERAL.

A DIPLOMAT.

A WELL-KNOWN AUTHOR.

A RELIGIOUS THINKER.

A REFUGEE.

DIALOGUE THE FOURTH.

“The Intelligentsia will ruin Russia.”
—“VEKHI.”²

GENERAL: To be quite frank, I do not understand this discussion about the spiritual meaning of Socialism, for I do not see that Socialism has any such meaning at all. The socialistic creed of the modern social-bourgeois, which proclaims matter to be the foundation of all life, is the summit of our capitalistic civilisation. Socialism is a deep, spiritual degeneracy and poverty, a poison which has permeated the whole of our life and killed the spirit. To acknowledge “class interest,” greed and envy as the sole motives in human intercourse, is worse than cannibalism.

PUBLIC MAN: But you cannot deny that true European Socialism implies a seeking for truth, a forecasting of a new life and a holy wrath. That is so obvious to me that I do not even think it requires proof. It is only in Russia that all this has been deformed and misrepresented.

GENERAL: Yes, the socialistic gentlemen have disclosed their true worth around the “public pie”—we know now what “class principles” mean. And the only consolation I can find in all this filth is that masks are now off and lies revealed. Only idiots or those who are spiritually dead can go on repeating parrot-wise their old catchwords and rejoicing at the thought that Russia has entered her socialistic paradise. Well is it

¹ Written in 1918; we understand they have been published in Germany.—ED.

² *Vekhi* (*Landmarks*). Written by leading liberal thinkers, of whom the present writer was one, after the failure of the Revolution of 1904-7.—ED.

that the people have turned upon these soft-headed idiots with a socialist cudgel.

AUTHOR: Well, Socialism is undoubtedly a delirious *idée fixe* of the Russian intelligentsia. Look at them: even at the present moment their political parties are engrossed in petty feuds and are convinced that evil befell Russia because power happened to go to the wrong group; that if it were they who had it, their party programme would certainly have led Russia straight into paradise. You read this in their newspapers and hear it publicly preached by their professors and authors—does it not strike you as being the height of self-satisfaction and stupidity—this! Yet they do not notice that their precious socialistic ideology is smashed to atoms and done for, that their party disputes have become as obsolete as the disputes of our Old-believers.

RELIG. THINKER: I cannot accept such a comparison; for I regard the questions raised by our Old-believers, and that you refer to, as full of importance even now; but I quite agree with you that a socialistic ideology can only thrive in very dense heads. And here I should like to say a word in defence of our nation against all the accusations heaped upon it. The thankless *rôle* of refuting Socialism seems to be our lot, for Russian Bolshevism is Socialism in spite of all its wildness. But we must not forget that we have undergone an acute form of poisoning by this European invention, which equals the worst of German asphyxiating gases, and it is not surprising that our people need tight-lacing after such an enormous injection of this powerful poison.

DIPLOMAT: Your explanation is certainly very favourable for the Russian nation, but hardly quite fair. There is no reason to make cultured European Socialism—which is the lawful sequence of capitalism—responsible for our barbarity. The Russian version of Socialism is: “Rob, kill and smash!” European Socialism has nothing in common with this D.T.!

RELIG. THINKER: But what I say is, that our nation is sick and poisoned. Of course the people are hardly civilised, even savage; but up till now the national wisdom of ages and Church teaching have instilled into them that it is wrong to run wild—people used to think it black and sinful to take to the road, and now they have been led to believe that murder and robbery are virtues. The people have been given a new commandment: “Be savage, know neither conscience nor honour, only vote for such and such a party.”

GENERAL: Yes, our people have been doped: Witte gave them vodka, the gentry—Socialism. And the accursed intelligentsia! First they drug themselves, and then poison and demoralise the entire nation. And look at their conceit, their self-satisfaction, even now when they have finally proved their worthlessness! How do you suppose a State can remain stable when its nervous system is poisoned? The salt of the earth! The poor, persecuted, idealistic, martyred intelligentsia! Why, it is a leprosy, a plague for Russia.

DIPLOMAT: You put it strongly, but not quite impartially, for it is incontestable that the intelligentsia is the principal enemy of your political utopias.

RELIG. THINKER: But really, all this socialist delirium is possibly as fatal for the Russian intelligentsia as Messianism was for the Jewish nation. They too had zealots, spiritual social revolutionaries, who tried Bolshevik experiments in Jerusalem during the siege. And, just think, it has been so with us even from the beginning—since Belinsky, Herten, Chernyshevsky¹—right down to our own days. Everything that did not fit in with the socialist standard was inevitably cast away, excommunicated—often the very flower of Russia, the creators of our culture. On the other hand, the intelligentsia has produced mostly talents of medium strength, seldom anything exceptional. And yet the intelligentsia is a mixed lot, teeming with the Third Element², the cream of its army. I think the gist of the matter lies entirely in the attitude of the intelligentsia to religion—in its atheism and nihilism.

GENERAL: Now this miserable intelligentsia has poisoned the people with nihilism and wrecked Russia. Let us say it outright—it is the intelligentsia that has ruined Russia. The world has never seen anything so horrible as what is happening now: the wild and furious wrath of a primitive people, poisoned by nihilism—a combination of the darkest sides of barbarity and civilisation. Nihilistic savages! This is the work of our intelligentsia. It has ravaged the soul of the people and done sacrilege to its faith, its holy of holies.

DIPLOMAT: Would you make out that we have no nihilism of our own? What about Dostoyevsky, and is not Gorky's creed nihilistic as well as national?

¹ Belinsky, Herten, Chernyshevsky—well-known critics, Liberal or Radical writers, and the latter two agitators of the 19th century.

² The Third Element was the name given to educated persons living in the country, unclassified whether as gentry or peasants,—for instance doctors, schoolmasters, and other zemstvo employees.—ED.

GENERAL : Red Indians, Samoyeds, Zulus—all savages have their religion—in short their cult and traditions, and therefore a spiritual culture. But here we see God replaced by the idea of “food.” Savages may worship a piece of wood, but never a delirious phantasm, as we see in Russia. Why, the comparison itself is insulting to the savage !

DIPLOMAT : But what can one say for a nation which allows itself to be corrupted in such a fashion? Or of a thousand year old Church culture which dissolves before Socialism without any resistance? What a colossal account history will tender to those who are responsible for the religious education of Russia ! No, if we must have a culprit, the Russian Church will be the obvious one and not the intelligentsia.

RELIG. THINKER : But what can you expect, when the educated classes—this very same intelligentsia—unanimously leave the Church and make atheism, revolution and socialism their creed. The Church is, of course, immutable as regards questions of grace, but she certainly needs the assistance of men of culture in her historical and educational work—a point in which Western Christianity is so much stronger. And where are the men of culture in Russia? Atheism has not only proved fatal to the intelligentsia itself, it is the curse of Russian life. We have heard a great deal about it for some time past, but now it has been made clear to everybody. And it is not even honest, serious atheism ; it smacks more of superstition in its levity and casualness. Only look at our provincial, so to say second-class, intelligentsia—a district doctor, village schoolmaster, or midwife ; they never even question their right to despise the people’s religion. They watch the phenomena of life and death, all the magnificent pageant of the world, and it suggests nothing to them. But this is not all. The intelligentsia is guilty of a still heavier crime ; it persecuted the Church by silent disdain, a passive boycott, and by surrounding the Church with an atmosphere of haughty indifference. You are aware that mere abstention from atheism required a good deal of moral courage because of the contempt such a way of thought aroused. I am thoroughly well acquainted with the intelligentsia, and I know what I say—the persecution raised against the Church by the Bolsheviks is as nothing compared to the demoralising effect of this silent persecution ; the former stimulates, calls for martyrdom—but to confess one’s faith in an atmosphere of silent contempt, to be poked fun at the whole time—no, believe me, it is worse than Bolshevism. Bolshevism is, of course, the lawful heir of the intelligentsia in its nihilism,

however stoutly they may deny it. And fate has ordained that the Church and the intelligentsia should meet under the heel of Bolshevism. God grant that this may bring them nearer one to another !

AUTHOR : Yes, but their godlessness makes the intelligentsia uncultural, iconoclastic, and even leads them to oppose culture. All culture is organically connected with a capacity for reverence—in this the psychology of nihilism is totally deficient. And that is why nothing is left open to our intelligentsia but spiritual idolatry, of which the worship of democracy and the people is a form. Therefore the intelligentsia has obstinately refused to concede a cultural or æsthetic influence to orthodoxy. Only very recently has attention been paid to the art in holy ikons or old church architecture. And now, amid the chaos of revolution, it is being voiced that the Church contains qualities precious for the State and even offers a “national sanctuary.” Of course I leave out all those who have sought refuge at the altar from political and socialist nightmares. But what has been gained is still too little for religion. The most exalted utilitarianism is inadmissible here. Each man must be seized by a religious fever, experience an individual religious crisis, be born anew and the rest shall be added to him. The spirit bloweth where it listeth, we cannot afford to lose this hope. Otherwise we are confronted with religious opportunism that can yield nothing but official political hypocrisy, so noxious in the old *régime*. To uphold religion for the benefit of the people, having none oneself, is as bad as nihilism.

GENERAL : Unfortunately there are legions of this nihilistic intelligentsia. The apparently innocent popular theatres, circulating libraries, workmen’s classes, etc., are practically instruments of religious demoralisation. Even when they are not directly aimed at the Church, they unconsciously undermine it by their silent disregard for Church regulations, by arranging lectures during service hours, or theatricals on the eve of a Church festival—often unintentionally, through mere thoughtlessness. And yet if anybody attempted to do such a thing in England Homeopathic doses often prove the most effective. It is only since the revolution that the public has felt indignant at the Bolsheviks celebrating the 1st of May on Wednesday in Holy week, though formerly everyone used to do the same on all possible occasions.

RELIG. THINKER : Yes, at present our intelligentsia is confronted with a dilemma : either it must regenerate spiritually and radically, revise all its spiritual possessions and mentality, or be

faced with decay, dissolution and historical death. The ideals of the revolution, the idols of humanitarianism and Socialism are dethroned, and have left a void ; for it must not be forgotten that our intelligentsia has always existed on a faith of some sort. And that part of it which has sufficient vitality to survive, is now called upon to confess its sins and begin a new life. No seed will live unless it dies first. The future of Russia now largely depends on the way the intelligentsia stands this crisis ; and a prayer, calling the Almighty's blessing upon it, escapes one's lips. May sight be given to blinded eyes ! If it could but overcome its inherent laziness and flightiness—traits that doomed it after our first revolution and because of which it learnt nothing then ! We now see the intelligentsia repeating all its errors of 1905, but on a magnified scale.

GENERAL : I am not as optimistic as you are concerning the regeneration of the intelligentsia. Look at them ; they are completely bewildered, have learnt nothing and go on repeating by rote " democratic " and socialistic platitudes. In general, I think, the intelligentsia has been one great misfortune for Russia and is of no use whatever to the country. What we want are good expert specialists and not self-appointed " saviours of the world," who always make a fuss about nothing and are generally useless when real work is wanted. They despise nothing so much as the " Bureaucracy " and yet, if you examine the question, you will find that the bureaucracy is the most disciplined, responsible and efficient group of educated men that the country has yet produced. In any case the intelligentsia has proved its real worth now—it is good for nothing but mere jabber. You cannot deny that, when things came to actual business, it could not have displayed its inefficiency more glaringly. No, the intelligentsia is a plague, a misfortune for Russia. You acknowledge yourself that the intelligentsia has nothing in common with Russian culture ; does that not imply that they are as totally foreign to European culture ? They are an infectious spiritual disease and ought to be isolated. They lost the war, demoralised the Army by their defeatism and democratical idiocy, thus driving Russia to perjury and treason and placing the whole world under the threat of Teutonic slavery.

AUTHOR : I most emphatically protest against blaming the intelligentsia alone. We are all at fault ; and everyone must come to see his own sins in what has happened, as well as the transgressions of society. Personally I realise my share of wrongdoing, although I cannot quite define it. In general, I do not consider

the matter to be quite as simple as you make out. Of course I do not deny that Bolshevism is the harvest of seeds sown mainly by the intelligentsia, for Bolshevism is the natural outcome of nihilism and worship of the people. And now the intelligentsia does not recognise its fetish in Caliban's semblance and is veering round to Chaadayev's pessimism. But what was and is fine in the intelligentsia, in spite of its moral blindness, is its readiness for sacrifice, which discloses the immortal beauty of its spirit.

GENERAL : We have had quite enough of such self-sacrifice—history can draw up the items. If the revolution has brought us any unquestionable benefit, it is that our rotten intelligentsia has collapsed with its delirium and hopeless vulgarity. Only they themselves in their self-satisfaction do not see that they now belong to the past, that Russia can manage splendidly without them.

AUTHOR : You are very much mistaken here—the intelligentsia and its future is a truly accursed question for Russia. I will go further : the way in which this question is going to be settled is vital for Russian history ; for the fate of Russia depends on how the intelligentsia defines itself. And what right have you to treat it as a body separate from the nation ? The intelligentsia is no longer a class, it is a phase of national growth. And Russia has irretrievably entered this phase of her history, as the Greeks did in the days of Plato, or the Romans under Augustus. After all, if you come to consider, the whole of Europe has passed through such a period. The old, impersonal, vegetative existence is disappearing everywhere and the principle of individual personality coming to the fore. It is as though mankind were being born anew, or, if you prefer it, has once more fallen, tasting anew of the fruit of the tree of life. No reaction or restoration can bring the old way of living back again. The most strenuous exertions in this direction can only achieve an imitation at the best. Our people have so easily been influenced by the intelligentsia because the old *modus vivendi* had lost its pliability and force of resistance. No, it is absolutely impossible for us to escape the intelligentsia.

RELIG. THINKER : But there is more than one kind of intelligentsia ; Dostoyevsky, Solovyev and the Slavophiles—are they not intelligentsia ? We do not want to do away with this type—it is the specific, good-for-nothing, nihilistic intelligentsia that we must resist, in the name of spiritual culture. We all hope that the lessons we have learnt through our trials will have cleared the spiritual vision of the intelligentsia and, what is still more im-

portant, will draw it nearer to the Church. At present, of course, the intelligentsia is passing through a very deep crisis, as, for the matter of that, the whole of Russia likewise.

REFUGEE : This crisis is, in reality, a much deeper one than it would seem at first sight. European civilisation itself is struggling with it, and the Russian intelligentsia is merely a more sensitive barometer. The causes of this crisis do not lie in the world war, but in the spiritual foundations of modern life. One might say that the Great War is a sequence, a symptom of this general crisis. It has been foretold and foreseen a long time ago ; art has spoken of it, and art has always been the world's seismograph. The eruption was boiling in the depths for ages. Were not cubism and futurism sufficiently clear indicators of the general decay ? The flesh of the world, its sense of beauty, were dissolving into nightmares and phantasms. The Russian intelligentsia stood in the ranks of this universal cubism, but Bolsheviks predominated. And, truly, their ravings about the coming of the world-revolution are not nearly so wild as people think. The Bolsheviks are clairvoyant, like men possessed by evil spirits, and, like Balaam's ass, can sometimes foretell the future.

DIPLOMAT : These depths I, as a positivist, am unable to fathom. But a world-wide crisis of Socialism is patent to me as well. The same hands that are applying all their energy to foster Bolshevism in the Russian revolution are fostering the general crisis. The War delivered the first blow to international Socialism, the Russian Bolsheviks have dealt it a second one.

REFUGEE : Still, Europe will not escape from her own Bolshevism. Europe will also suffer from the pangs of a world revolution, and red socialistic riots will rave over her. This is bound to happen, in spite of Socialism being already dead. Any stimulant, although it has outlived itself, must experimentally realise its own worthlessness. And the Russian intelligentsia, the spiritual parent of Bolshevism, is undoubtedly the vanguard of a general riot—for such were the dreams of the Russian revolutionary Slavophiles from Bakunin to Lenin, notwithstanding their theoretical internationalism.

RELIG. THINKER : I consider the moral side of Socialism to be so low, that I do not even think it can have a crisis. Such revolutions are bourgeois in their essence, if you exclude a certain number of fanatics, blind in their delirium. And, inasmuch as petty bourgeois instincts are sterile and shallow, so is a socialistic revolution. *Æsthetics* are the most impartial witness here ; only

apply æsthetical standards to the intelligentsia, democracy or socialism—as Leontiev¹ did—and nothing is left. Unsavoury and misshapen, it has created nothing fine, neither a song nor even a *beau geste*. Its possessions are all stolen, banal and vulgar—a dirty red rag and the Marseillaise, pilfered just when we were about to play the traitor towards France. On one of the first days of the revolution I happened to watch a demonstration in the streets of Moscow; I am a reticent man, fond of the people, but I boiled with indignation and disgust. If Leontiev could have only seen this!—but he foresaw it. And in my opinion, anything so mean and ugly cannot be right.

AUTHOR: Such a superman's æsthetical mantle hardly becomes us; it only serves to hide the want of love we share with Leontiev. Every picture must have a perspective. Spring floods are beautiful and mighty, yet when closely examined they reveal nothing but foam and mud. To contemplate elemental popular movements, the heart must be wise and benevolent. Goethe knew that, and he certainly understood æsthetical standards. Recollect Faust and Wagner at the fair, that splendid monologue: "Von Eise befreit sind Strom und Bäche"!

RELIG. THINKER: Yes, but he speaks of a holiday-making crowd, and not of a mob poisoned by demagogy. Although I will concede so much to you: if this disorderly mass has any rhythm, it is the rhythm that has for some time now been sought after by futurism. Futurism is certainly an artistic prophecy of ochlocracy. Its present connection with Bolshevism is no accident. You recollect futuristic attempts to combine colour: charcoal, rags and what not—their partiality for everything incongruous, loud and ugly, with some sort of unpleasant meaning to the whole? Well, when watching the demonstration in Moscow, I had a live futurist picture before me. Their poetical attempts are of the same type—the way they introduce senseless sounds and mutterings into verse. Have it as you will, I cannot find any artistic enjoyment in all this.

REFUGEE: Your own argument goes against you. If Socialism is connected in some hidden way with futurism, which I think it is, then it has its own meaning and sense, as a symptom of universal dissolution and crisis. Beauty has departed from the world; futurism is the living witness of that and of the suffering and seeking of all creation. The world is sick, and so is art. And this is why the mob is so monstrous . . . Life does not bring forth

¹ Leontiev, one of the chief Slavophil leaders of the sixties and seventies of the last century.

beauty. Leontiev felt that deeply, but would not acknowledge it. He was always trying to juggle things back in time; but there is no need for juggling; for all creation is tending towards supreme beauty and the light of transfiguration.

GENERAL: All this may be very fine, but it is eye-wash, an attempt to disguise reality. Since the revolution we have been living in unadulterated filth, in a pig-sty. We are losing the faculty of human speech. See what has become of our language with the new disgusting orthography, an invention of nihilism—another gift of the Cadets!—the comrades' jargon and futurist words; I feel that they are gradually influencing me too. Life itself is simply revolting: a low mob on one side and a washed-out intelligentsia on the other. "Odi profanum vulgus et arceo"—true, even in the days of Horace. And I refuse to see a single bright spot in Russian life at present.

SERGIUS BULGAKOV.

(*Translated by Mrs. Pashkov.*)

THE TRADE BALANCE OF RUSSIA.

A critical Analysis of the Methods adopted in the Collection of Trade Statistics.

GENERAL NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE SUBJECT

It may be asked why the trade balance of a country should be subjected to a special investigation, however superficial. The answer is to be found in the fact that the term is still widely used in various connections, and still exercises considerable influence over public opinion: despite the number of years that have elapsed since Adam Smith refuted the crude Mercantilist argument that the value of a country's exports should always exceed the value of her imports, so as to leave her with a favourable balance of wealth in the shape of actual coin. The confusion between money and wealth involved in the latter idea has long since been made clear, but the idea still holds that a favourable trade balance *in goods* is proof of a prosperous economic condition in a country, and is also a safeguard for the stability of its financial system, if its exports are the only, or chief, means of obtaining bullion (as was the case in Russia). It will therefore be instructive to consider how far the conception of a trade balance may be looked upon as a trustworthy guide to the formation of an opinion on the economic status of one or of several countries.

The information desired by different countries in calculating their balance of trade is in all cases the same. They want to know the exact price the country has to pay for the goods she has received from abroad during any one year, and the exact price she has to receive for her exports to other countries during the same period. The difference between these two amounts should constitute her trade balance.¹ Even if the figures were absolutely reliable for both amounts, we may question whether the information gained is in any way conclusive. The importance of a favourable trade balance for the maintenance of the stability of the gold standard was taken for granted before the entrance of disturbing factors brought about by the Great War, but it

¹ See "G.B.V.'s" article (Mr. Guryev) in the *Bulletin russe de Statistique financière et de Législation* for 1897. St. Petersburg, 1894-1900.

is extremely difficult to establish whether or not a favourable balance always implies an import of precious metals into the country enjoying it. The question has been taken up with regard to Russo-German trade, where the trade balance was, as a rule, unfavourable to Germany. In spite of this, however, German financiers have established that there was no flow of precious metal from Germany to Russia.¹ On the contrary, certain factors were instrumental in causing the importation of Russian gold into Germany, for instance, (1) the expenditure of Russians resident or travelling in Germany; (2) the interest payable on German investments in Russia; (3) the interest payable by Russia on account of loans contracted in Germany. These, along with several minor reasons, had considerable effect upon the importation of Russian gold into Germany during the years when her importation of goods was not sufficient. The year 1891 serves as a case in point, when, on account of the famine, the Russian Government was compelled to prohibit the export of corn (particularly rye). In view, therefore, of the other elements which require to be taken into consideration, it will be seen that the trade balance, in itself, can hardly be taken as the basis of any definite conclusions, even if its accuracy is beyond doubt. But in no case can absolute accuracy be obtained; it is impossible to calculate exports and imports to nearer than, say, 15 per cent. ; hence the difference between them, the balance, may vary between very wide limits. We may quote here some figures illustrating this point from Mr. Guryev's article in the *Bulletin Russe* :—

Imports.

4,285 mill. marks, or $(4,285 \times 85 \%) = 3,642$, or
 $(4,285 \times 115 \%) = 4,928$ m.m.

Exports.

3,051 mill. marks, or $(3,051 \times 85 \%) = 2,593$, or
 $(3,051 \times 115 \%) = 3,508$ m.m.

The actual balance may, therefore, be anywhere between 134 million marks (3,642–3,508) and $2\frac{1}{3}$ milliards (4,928–2,593).

¹ Human, Arth. *Der Deutsch-Russ. Handels- u. Schiffahrtsvertrag v. 20. März 1894.* Leipzig, 1900, p. 52.

Precious metal sent to Russia.

From Russia.

<p>1894 - - 24.2 mill. marks.</p> <p>1896 - - 132.5 „ „</p>	<p>1894 - - 104.6 mill. marks.</p> <p>1896 - - 6.5 „ „</p>
---	--

There were great fluctuations from year to year.

MODE OF DEALING WITH THE PROBLEM: METHODS OF VALUATION.

Having considered in brief the nature of a trade balance, we must now approach the practical question as to how the figures referring to exports and imports, and consequently the balance, are arrived at. This depends, of course, how goods on entering or leaving a country are valued. The two main methods in use are: (1) declarations of importers and exporters; and (2) official values. These may be used separately or in conjunction by different countries.

(1) *Declarations.*

In this method, the basis of valuation is the statements made by importers and exporters when receiving goods from abroad, or sending goods out of the country. As will be shown in greater detail later, Mr. Guryev shows the enormous discrepancies which may and do exist between such declarations and the actual facts. The trustworthiness of this method obviously rests upon factors which may differ very widely in different countries. On the one hand, it depends how far merchants feel in duty bound to adhere strictly to the truth in making such statements, *i.e.*, upon the state of commercial morality in the country,¹ this in turn depending upon the standard of culture and morality attained by the country, the justice of its tariff laws, and so on. Even if men are naturally honest, oppressive and unjust tariff laws may make them feel quite justified in resorting to deceit and evasion wherever possible, as was the case in Germany before the drawing up of the "Zollverein." On the other hand, it depends on the severity of the penalties exacted for fraud or undervaluation, and the effectiveness of the supervisory service.² A strict Customs law, rigidly enforced by efficient and trustworthy officials, would render false declarations a matter of much greater difficulty than would be the case if the opposite conditions prevailed. In this connection it is interesting to note the complaint of Mr. Titov, in his speech in the Duma of 24 May, 1913,³ that Russian Customs officials were overburdened with work, owing

¹ T. E. G. Gregory, *Tariffs: A Study in Methods*. London, 1921, Chap. IX., "Valuation and Allied Problems."

² The position in Britain is regulated by the Customs Consolidation Act of 1876, and the penalty for fraud is a fine of £100.

³ State Duma. Stenographic Notes. Sitting 54, 24 May, 1913. (In Russian.)

to the paucity of their numbers, and were therefore incapable of carrying out their duties efficiently.

Further, we must consider the *place* at which the goods are valued, at the frontier, or at the point of departure, and how far coverings and wrappings are included in the value. The basis may be taken as the same for most countries, *i.e.*, the wholesale market price, but different methods may be used in the addition of (a) all or a selection of oncosts to the point of shipment; (b) all or a series of supplementary costs to the point of landing; (c) various degrees of packing allowances. All these elements are of concrete importance as affecting the ultimate value of the goods. The question of wrappings is an important one, and receives different treatment in different countries.¹ A fixed allowance may be made for wrappings as established by the authorities (Russia), or the gross weight may be taken, *i.e.*, the weight of the article plus all its coverings (Germany, for some commodities), or the actual weight of the goods themselves may be given where this is possible.

(2) *Official Valuation Duties.*

Most of the European countries base their values on official schedules, subjected to revision at the close of each year, or at stated intervals. The great difficulty is to secure accuracy and justice in the fixation of these values, and here again uniformity of method is not to be found. As Gregory points out in the chapter of his book previously referred to, if these values are fixed in consultation with the mercantile community—what Giffen calls computed values, as distinct from official, real, declared, and realised values—there is danger of undervaluation in articles of trade where influential merchants are concerned. On the other hand, if the Government ignores the mercantile community in fixing its scale of values, it is in danger of being out of touch with current price movements, and therefore inflicting injustice upon importers.

The difference between official and declared values² is of considerable importance when prices are either rising or falling

¹ For the regulations with regard to Russia, *vide* No. 569, Miscellaneous Series, Diplomatic and Consular Reports, *Russia: Regulations concerning the receipt and release of goods by the Customs Establishments*. (Cd. 787-5.)

A translation by Mr. A. A. Wotzel, of the Board of Trade, of the Russian regulations concerning the Receipt of Goods into the Jurisdiction of the Customs Establishments, the Inspection thereof, Payment of Duty thereon, and Release thereof.

² *Foreign Trade and Commerce, 1911.* Introductory Note.

rapidly. Such changes of prices are fully reflected in the values of the goods imported or exported, where the method of declared values is adopted. But in the case of annually revised official values, the effect of changes in price is only shown in the corrected figures issued after the annual revision is completed. "A country with official values would show steady progress in a time of falling prices, while a country with declared values, as in the United Kingdom, would show a falling off, although in both countries the real movement might be much the same"¹

DIFFICULTIES OF A COMPARATIVE STUDY.

Russia's methods of valuation will have to be gone into separately; but at the present stage it will be useful to indicate a few points which make it necessary to proceed with great caution before drawing conclusions from a direct comparison between her trade statistics and those of other countries with whom she had commercial connections. For example, in Great Britain, the method of "declarations" is exclusively used. In the official publication for 1920, entitled "Annual Statement of the Trade of the United Kingdom with Foreign Countries and British Possessions," Introductory Note we find information to the following effect: "Statements of both quantities and values are based on declarations of importers and exporters as subsequently checked by the Customs officials." From the Customs Consolidation Act (1876) we learn that importers and exporters declare the value of the goods on the basis of the invoice, bill of lading, or other authoritative document descriptive of the goods. In Russia, however, both methods we have indicated are used. Further, in Russian statistics, the countries which issue the carriage note for the goods are taken as the countries of origin and destination.² But in the same "Annual Statement" for Great Britain we are informed that after 1908, imports into Britain were classified as received from the countries whence they were consigned to us, and not from the country whence they were shipped direct to the United Kingdom. Exports were credited to the country of "final destination," *i.e.*, the country to which they were consigned, whether it possessed a seaboard or not. Hence it is not surprising to find that Russian and British statistics for trade between the two countries do not correspond. The only directly comparable figures available

¹ Giffen, *op. cit.*, p. 150.

² Ricci, Umberto, *Notes sur les Statistiques du Commerce extérieur dans les différents Pays*. Rome, 1914.

are somewhat vitiated by being taken during, or close to, the disturbances of war conditions, but will serve as an illustration of the position

Exports, Russia to Britain, according to the Customs Figures of the respective Countries.

Russian Statistics. British Statistics.

1913	-	-	-	£26,780,000	£40,270,000
1914	-	-	-	18,960,000	28,092,000
1915	-	-	-	15,550,000	21,424,000

With regard to Russo-German trade, it has to be noted that in Russian statistics all transit goods passing through Germany to Russia are given under the heading of German trade; on the other hand, goods shipped to non-German ports are excluded, although the merchandise may be destined for the German market. Thus there would not be included in the trade balance with Germany the large quantities of corn shipped to Dutch and Belgian ports, and from there distributed among other countries, one of which was Germany. An interesting table, showing the discrepancies between Russian and German statistics for the mutual trade of the two countries, may be quoted from p. 48 of Mr. Emil Zweig's book, *Die Russische Handelspolitik seit 1877*.

Russo-German Special Commerce, excluding precious metals.

According to German Statistics.						According to Russian Statistics.			
Year.	German Import from Russia.	Per cent. of Total Import.	German Export to Russia.	Per cent. of Total Export.	Russian Export to Germany.	Per cent. of Total Imports.	Russian Import from Germany.	Per cent. of Total Imports.	
(In Million Marks.)									
1894	-	439·3	11·2	170·6	5·8	319·4	22·1	308·8	25·6
1895	-	567·9	13·8	207·8	6·3	387·2	26·0	379·4	32·6
1896	-	628·2	14·6	231·6	5·9	397·5	26·7	410·8	32·2
1897	-	698·4	14·9	241·3	6·6	378·6	24·1	388·5	32·1
1898	-	725·3	14·3	273·2	7·3	387·6	24·5	436·7	32·7
1899	-	620·7	11·3	325·1	7·7	353·3	26·1	498·7	35·4
1900	-	670·7	11·6	313·0	6·8	405·3	26·2	468·4	34·6
1901	-	668·7	12·3	301·8	6·8	386·3	23·5	455·7	35·5
1902	-	758·9	13·5	299·5	6·4	438·8	23·6	450·3	34·8
1903	-	822·3	13·7	324·4	6·5	502·1	—	509·1	—

In connection with the question of discrepancies, Mr. V. Pokrovsky makes an interesting statement in the Supplementary volume to Brockhaus's *Encyclopedia*, 1907. He explains that foreign statistics always show larger sums for goods coming from Russia than do Russian statistics, because the former include transport, insurance, and similar expenses. But the discrepancies still seem to be too large to be covered by such an explanation. For instance, he gives the following figures :—

Year 1905.	Russian Statistics.	German Statistics.
Russian export to Germany	- £25·5 million.	£46 million
„ „ „ Britain	- 24·9 „	31·6 „

For an excellent statement of the dangers involved in the reckless use of statistics, without proper reservations and safeguards, the reader is referred to an essay on *Import and Export Statistics*, by R. Giffen.¹ The author gives a clear indication of the difficulties in the way of a comparative study, and shows that untrustworthiness in trade statistics is a failing not peculiar to Russia alone, but is shared by all other commercial nations.

THE PROBLEM AS APPLIED TO RUSSIA.

We find figures as to Russia's trade balance in the *General Review of Foreign Trade along the European and Asiatic Frontiers*, edited yearly by the Customs Duties Department. From 1902 to 1912, the favourable balance shows a yearly average of about 330 million roubles; in 1911 it reached the sum of 429 million roubles, while in 1913 it fell as low as 146 million roubles. On the outbreak of the war in 1914 the trade balance suffered an immediate change, which reacted unfavourably upon Russia; for 1914 and 1915 it shows a deficit of 141 million roubles, and 736 million roubles respectively. This is in strong contrast with the previous eighteen-year period from 1894 to 1912, during which the favourable trade balance showed an almost constant increase—apparently not adversely affected by the Protective Customs tariff. The following table, taken from the *General Reviews* for various years, gives a clear indication of the situation.

¹ *Essays on Finance*. Second Series. London, 1890.

"General Review" for 1912.

Year.	Export.	Import.	Turnover.	Balance.	Customs.	Equivalent of balance in sterling.*
(In Million Roubles.)						
1902-1906 -	1,008·0	673·6	1,681·6	334·4	236·2	£33,440,000
1907-1911 -	1,303·9	982·5	2,286·4	321·4	298·6	32,140,000
1911 - -	1,591·4	1,161·7	2,753·1	429·7	336·8	42,970,000
1912 - -	1,518·8	1,171·8	2,690·6	347·0	336·0	34,700,000

"General Review" for 1913 (p. V.).

1913 - -	1,520·1	1,374·0	2,894·1	146·1	377	14,610,000
----------	---------	---------	---------	-------	-----	------------

"General Review" for 1915 (p. IV.).

1914 - -	956·1	1,098·0	2,054·1	141·9	—	14,190,000
1915 - -	401·8	1,138·6	1,540·4	736·8	—	73,680,000

"General Review" for 1915 (cont.).

1894-98 -	701·2	568·5	1,269·7	132·7	—	13,270,000
1899-1903 -	793·3	630·2	1,423·5	163·1	—	16,310,000
1904-08 -	1,046·0	769·5	1,815·5	276·5	—	27,650,000

* Taking £1 = 10 roubles. Before the Great War, 1 rouble = 2s. 1½d.

The lack of uniformity, even in official figures published within the country, is shown by the following comparison between some of the *General Review* figures and figures taken from the *Russian Money Market*, 1908-1912, Ministry of Finance—Special Chancery for Credit. Diagram 2. Commercial Balance of Russia (exports and imports):—

	Year.	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
(In Million Roubles.)				
<i>General Review</i> -	1909	1,426·4	903·2	523·2
<i>Money Market</i> -	—	1,427·7	906·3	521·4
Difference - -	—	1·3	3·1	1·8 = £180,000
<i>General Review</i> -	1910	1,448·8	1,085·3	363·5
<i>Money Market</i> -	—	1,449·1	1,084·4	364·7
Difference - -	—	0·3	0·9	1·2 = £120,000
<i>General Review</i> -	1911	1,524·0	1,176·8	347·2
<i>Money Market</i> -	—	1,591·4	1,161·7	429·7
Difference - -	—	67·4	15·1	82·5 = £8,250,000
<i>General Review</i> -	1912	1,457·3	1,162·7	294·6
<i>Money Market</i> -	—	1,518·8	1,171·8	347·0
Difference - -	—	61·5	9·1	52·4 = £5,240,000

Note the considerable discrepancies for the years 1911 and 1912.

We now come to the question as to what was the basis of valuation in the official Russian returns: and information on this point is available in a monthly publication issued by the Customs Department under the title of *Foreign Trade on the European Frontier*. From p. XV. of the December, 1910, issue

of this publication, we gather the impression that the valuation is based upon the Customs prices (*tamozheniya tsyeny*). If we adopt a simple method of verification, this mode of valuation can be shown to lack absolute accuracy. The method was as follows. On p. 31 of the *General Review* for 1915 we find a list of exports and imports from 1904-15, given in thousands of puds and thousands of roubles. By multiplying the 1910 figure in puds by the average Customs price for the commodity in the monthly publication, we ought to get the amount in roubles in the *General Review*, if the method of valuation is correctly applied. The following table shows some characteristic results. A plus indicates that the figure thus worked out is larger than the figure in the *General Review*, and a minus the opposite.

Year 1910. In thousands of roubles.

Commodity.	Figure worked out.	Figure in <i>General Review.</i>	Difference	
			sterling.	in thousand roubles.
EXPORTS.				
Wheat - - - -	404,557	405,198	+ £64,100	+ 641
Rye - - - -	29,998	29,867	— 13,100	— 131
Barley - - - -	159,056	158,521	— 53,500	— 535
Oats - - - -	63,800	63,698	— 10,200	— 102
Maize - - - -	19,197	19,172	— 2,500	— 25
Flour (corn) - - -	12,685	12,555	— 13,000	— 130
Flax - - - -	66,360	67,151	+ 79,100	+ 791
Hemp - - - -	9,733	9,728	— 500	— 5
Butter - - - -	51,112	51,294	+, 18,200	+ 182
Eggs - - - -	63,687	63,694	+ 1,600	+ 16
IMPORTS.				
Rice - - - -	10,189	8,241	— £194,800	— 1,948
Coffee - - - -	6,666	6,739	+ 7,300	+ 73
Herrings - - - -	20,203	20,125	— 7,800	— 78
Coal - - - -	31,122	30,283	— 83,900	— 839
Coke - - - -	3,882	3,784	— 9,800	— 98
Cast-iron - - - -	174	597	+ 42,300	+ 423
Iron - - - -	2,858	2,971	+ 11,300	+ 113

Assuming that the basis for the commodity groups is the same in both cases, it will be obvious that these discrepancies are sufficiently serious to make us doubt whether the trade balance figure for 1910 (and, by inference, for other years as well) is to be relied on.

A second method of valuation is mentioned on the inside of the introductory page of the *General Review* for 1915, a literal translation of which runs as follows: "At the basis of the valuation of goods are placed the Customs notes (*zapisi*) according

to the *declarations of the senders and receivers of goods*, verified by the data for the principal goods contained in the Department of Customs Incomes, quoted in the exchanges, and also the exchange bulletins." In the 1897 edition of the *Bulletin russe* we find information which amplifies the somewhat laconic statement just given, particularly as regards importation into Russia. Mr. Guryev discusses the intrinsic value of importers' declarations, taking British rails as an example (from British exporters, year 1894). He gives a comparison between the prices declared on their passing through the Russian Customs Office at St. Petersburg and the exchange price of rails at St. Petersburg at the same time, showing that the first was considerably greater than the second. It is obviously absurd that Russia should be buying rails from Britain at 556·50 francs per ton, when, as he puts it, the whole of industrial Europe was ready to deliver to her precisely the same commodity at 110 francs per ton. The writer holds that the total error, involved for Russian importation by such overestimates of price, amounts to at least 20 per cent., adding that the declarations of high prices at the Customs Office might justify the imposition of a high scale of prices when marketing the imports. This method of import valuation based on declaration is calculated not only to embarrass the financial statistician, but also to render him disinclined to base his calculations on the figures given for the total value of the imports into Russia. Hence follows the breakdown of one of the two elements going to make up the trade balance.

As far as exporters' declarations are concerned, it is left to the German student¹ of the Commercial Treaty of 1894 to make suggestions as to their probable defects. Mr. Guryev was inclined to look upon these declarations as more trustworthy, but we must remember that, since he was an apologist for the Russian financial system, it was to his interest to minimise Russian importation as far as possible, and thus suggest that the trade balance was more favourable than it appeared in official statistics by some hundred million roubles. The German author, however, being quite disinterested from this point of view, is in a position to examine the question as to whether these exporters' declarations are really reliable. He takes as his starting point Mr. Guryev's statement that the valuation for export is officially made by the Customs officers, and that for this purpose they adopt the local exchange prices, for such goods at least as are quoted on the exchanges. As, however, the exporter had to pay for this

¹ Zweig, Emil, *op. cit.* See also Human, Arth., *op. cit.*, pp. 55-62 (Russian statistics).

valuation a sum representing a certain percentage of his declaration, the author maintains that he would have a direct interest in minimising the value of the goods.¹ If this assumption is correct, the second component of the trade balance is also shown to have serious defects.

In view of the importance of the corn export as an element in Russian trade statistics, it will be instructive to quote certain facts from a criticism of the Customs valuation of the corn export, found on p. 11 sqq. of Mr. V. S. Pokrovsky's *Collection of Information, historical and statistical, as to the foreign Trade of Russia* (St. Petersburg, 1902). He points out that since the value of the corn export amounts to half the value of Russia's total exports, it is a matter of great importance to test the accuracy of the figures taken as the basis of the various tables, etc., presented to readers in publications dealing with foreign trade.

His first conclusion is that Customs prices may be relied upon in all questions of a general character, since, within well-defined limits, they follow after market prices. He bases this conclusion upon a comparison, extending in five-yearly spells from 1851 to 1885, between the average Customs valuation, and the price of each cereal in its most important market. The years 1865-71, during which an unsuccessful effort was made to establish permanent Customs prices, are omitted from consideration. His results were as follows: in the case of wheat, the greatest average deviation of the Customs price from the price in Odessa was not more than 5 per cent.; rye (cp. St. Petersburg), 16 per cent.; barley (cp. Odessa), 31 per cent.; oats (cp. St. Petersburg), 22 per cent. If a shorter period from 1871 to 1885 is taken, the results are even better, being wheat 4 per cent., rye 4 per cent., barley 12 per cent., and oats 7 per cent.

This, however, does not demonstrate the *intrinsic* accuracy of the Customs figures, for questions requiring detailed investigation. To test this, he takes figures for the period 1890-97, the main results of which are shown in the two tables set out below. The "market prices" are calculated as follows: for wheat, the prices of Odessa, Nikolayev, Rostov, Novorossisk are taken; for rye, the same, with the addition of St. Petersburg and Libau; for barley, the same as for wheat; for oats, St. Petersburg, Riga and Libau. The London prices are derived from the *Economist*:—

¹ *Customs Statute (Ustav Tamozheny)*. 1910 edition, art. 83, parag. 2. "The List of the Chancery Fees for the composition and transcription of Customs documents, fixes for the export list, and any document of the same kind, for commodities not subject to an export duty, a fee of 20 kopeks per 1,000 roubles declared value." (This = 0.02 per cent., which might amount to a considerable sum on large quantities.)

Table 22, p. 13.—*Customs valuation of wheat, compared with Market and London prices, for the years 1890-97.¹*

1.		2.		3.	4.	5.		
Year.	Cost of 1 pud (36 lbs.) of Wheat in Metal Kopeks.		Difference in Metal Kopeks.	Equivalent in Pence.	Customs Price ex- pressed as percen- tage of Market.	Price of 1 pud of Local Corn on London Market in Metal Kopeks.	Equivalent of Column 4 in pence.	Difference between Customs and Lon- don Prices in Metal Kopeks.
	Cus- toms.	Mar- ket.						
1890 -	71·5	64·9	+6·6	+1·7	110·2	72·7	18·2	— 1·2
1891 -	70·5	72·1	—1·6	—·4	97·8	83·5	20·9	— 13·0
1892 -	60·4	58·7	+1·7	+·4	102·9	68·3	17·1	— 7·9
1893 -	56·7	49·7	+7·7	+1·8	114·1	59·9	15·0	— 3·2
1894 -	46·7	39·1	+7·6	+1·9	119·5	52·2	13·1	— 5·5
1895 -	43·9	43·9	0	0	100·0	52·4	13·1	— 8·5
1896 -	49·8	51·3	—1·5	—·3	97·1	59·2	14·8	— 9·4
1897 -	61·6	62·1	—0·5	—·1	99·2	71·5	17·9	— 9·9

Similar separate tables are given for rye, barley, oats, maize. In the following table the figures are combined, so as to show the total effect of the various differences upon the gross value of the corn export.

Table 27.—*Cost of wheat, rye, barley, oats, maize, exported from Russia 1890-97, according to the Market and Customs prices.*

Year.	1	2.	3.	4.	
	Market Cost.	Cost accord- ing to Customs Valua- tion.	Differ- ence.	Equivalent of Column 3 in Sterling.	Connection between Customs Valuation for Corn Export and Market Value as percentage.
		(1,000 Metal Roubles.)			
1890 -	213,617	229,221	+ 15,604	+ £1,560,400	107·3
1891 -	231,607	219,466	— 12,141	— 1,214,100	94·8
1892 -	88,560	92,202	+ 3,642	+ 364,200	104·1
1893 -	161,353	175,069	+ 13,716	+ 1,371,600	108·5
1894 -	201,192	231,911	+ 30,719	+ 3,071,900	115·3
1895 -	201,482	204,932	+ 3,450	+ 345,000	101·2
1896 -	195,820	194,982	— 838	— 83,800	99·6
1897 -	212,961	213,625	+ 664	+ 66,400	100·3

¹ 1 pud = 36 lbs; 1 kopek = $\frac{1}{4}$ d.

The figures given in this section would seem to indicate that Russian trade statistics can only be taken as affording useful indications as to general tendencies. In view of the possibilities of error which have been shown to exist, they cannot be said to afford a secure basis for definite conclusions on matters requiring any considerable degree of accuracy.

VIEWS UPON THE MAINTENANCE OF A FAVOURABLE BALANCE

The question as to whether it is necessary for the financial and economic stability of Russia that a favourable balance of trade should be maintained, has been widely discussed both by Russian writers and by foreign students of the country. Mr. Drage, for example,¹ in a criticism of the policy pursued by Witte during his tenure of office as Minister of Finance (1893-1903) holds that the maintenance of a favourable trade balance did not have a good effect upon the general economic welfare of the country. As we have seen, Russia during the years 1893-1903 enjoyed a favourable balance, as indicated by the annual excess of exports over imports. This Witte construed in a beneficial light as regards the economic prosperity of the country, and assigned for its appearance three main reasons. The first of these was the increased export of industrial produce; the second, the decreased import of machinery and similar products; the third, the fact that some goods formerly brought from abroad were now supplied by home industry.

Mr. Drage, however, makes a detailed examination of what was really involved in the favourable balance of trade, particularly with regard to the agricultural classes. The continuance of this balance was a necessity, if foreign creditors were to receive regular payment of interest on the capital they had advanced to found Russian industries and assist in railway expansion. And though the export of industrial products from Russia was increasing, it had not yet attained any considerable proportions, and five-sevenths of the country's exports still consisted of agricultural produce.² If it is borne in mind that a large proportion of the population of Russia (78 per cent. according to Mr. Drage, although other writers put it even higher) depend entirely on agriculture for their support, it will be obvious that agriculture, in order to perform the double duty of providing nourishment for the home population and affording a large surplus for export, would have to be in a state of high

¹ Drage, Geoffrey, *Russian Affairs*, p. 311. London, 1904.

² This statement is corroborated by the following table, found in the

efficiency and productivity. The contrary was, however, the case, Russian agriculture standing very low in the scale of productivity as compared with other nations.

Mr. Drage's conclusion is that the policy of maintaining a favourable balance of trade was carried out at the expense of the agricultural population, who were suffering from physical deterioration and a lowering of the standard of life, even in the richest provinces. Protection tied down the peasantry to primitive methods of production by putting the price of agricultural machinery far beyond their reach. Further, it raised the cost of living, thus diminishing the amount of stock the peasantry could afford to carry, and still further impoverishing the land through lack of manure. Since the economic strength of the Empire rested mainly on the peasantry and agriculture of European Russia, critics maintained that a policy which led to their impoverishment could not be beneficial to the country. On these grounds they would have preferred to see Russia confining herself to agriculture only, and not endeavouring to develop industries.

This criticism only takes account of the general aspect of the problem, which ought really to be subdivided and studied in detail. A question particularly worthy of consideration would be—From what part of Russia was the surplus corn mainly drawn? It might possibly be found that the contribution from South Russia was of considerable importance, and in this connection it would be interesting to estimate the influence of the German settlers who, in the 70's of last century, converted the region from a sheep-rearing to a corn-producing area, and who held 4,204,000 "desyatines"¹ (10,930,400 acres) of land, 665,000

General Review for 1915:—

Export of the four groups of commodities, with their percentage to the total export.

	1894- 98.	1899- 1903.	1904- 08.	1909- 13.	1913.	1914.	1915.
1. Foodstuffs -	59·5	58·7	59·9	60·5	55·2	54·7	50·2
2. Raw material and half manu- factured goods	34·9	34·4	33·0	33·2	36·9	36·5	36·0
3. Animal products	2·1	2·2	1·7	1·8	2·3	1·5	0·1
4. Manufactures -	3·5	4·7	5·4	4·5	5·6	7·3	13·7
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Note the preponderance of foodstuffs, although manufactures were making some headway even before 1914.

¹ A "desyatine" = 2·6 acres.

" desyatines " (1,729,000 acres) of which they obtained from the Crown.¹

Other writers review the problem more from the point of view of the importance of a favourable balance for the maintenance of the gold standard.² Here we may point out the distinction between the trade balance, calculated on the basis of the export and import of commodities, and the financial balance, calculated on the basis of the export and import of the precious metals. It may be assumed that the latter is affected by (a) the development of the productive forces within the country, and (b) a financial policy which is directed in general to limiting the increase of liabilities to foreign countries. Mr. Emil Zweig, in his *History of Russia's Commercial Policy since 1877* (i.e., from the introduction of payment of Customs duties in gold), holds that Russia's commercial policy, embodying both factors outlined under (a) and (b) above, is only to be explained by her policy of territorial expansion, to which, apparently, he attributes the greater part of her foreign debts. Mr. Migulin,³ on the other hand, attributes the greater part of these debts to the liquidation of the old Mortgage Banks in 1860, and the construction and development of the railway system. Although he wrote in 1905 under comparatively favourable conditions, he seems to look with a pessimistic eye upon the prospects of Russia's home production during the next few decades. He maintained that the only way of increasing Russia's exports—and hence her favourable balance—at comparatively short notice was by means of fresh territorial acquisitions, or at least by the penetration of new areas producing raw materials. On p. 19 of *The War and our Finances* he lays stress on Russia's interests in Persia as regards the production of cotton and tea, and in Mongolia as regards cattle.

If such are the views of a Russian writer, we are hardly surprised to encounter similar pessimism when we turn to the writings of W. Fajans, a foreign student of Russia's gold standard.⁴ Reviewing the general tendency of Russia's trade balance,⁵ he concludes that the prospects of the corn export

¹ See E. Schmid, *Die deutschen Bauern in Südrussland*. Berlin, 1917. Also Hume, George, *Thirty-five Years in Russia*. London, 1914, p. 61.

² Migulin, P. P., *Reform of the Currency in Russia and the Commercial Crisis* (of 1899) 1893-1902. Kharkov. 1902, p. 30, *et seq.* (In Russian.)

³ *Ibid.*; *The War and our Finances*. Kharkov, 1905; and *The History of Russian State Credit*. Kharkov, 1899. (In Russian.)

⁴ Table 72.

⁵ *Die russische Goldwährung*, pp. 118-179.

from European Russia are practically nil, and its augmentation only possible at the expense of a decrease in consumption (p. 154). The expansion of corn export for Asiatic Russia, *i.e.*, Siberia, is still a question of the future, while the exportation of 1906 and earlier was in reality only rendered possible by a reduction in consumption. If this consumption were raised to a normal average of 19 puds per head, export would have to be reduced by 71 per cent. (pp. 141-161). He assumes the total yield to be 21.25 puds per head, which sum represents a surplus of 2.25 puds per head, thus permitting an exportation of 300 million puds (surplus corn). The actual exportation, however, was 514 million puds, the excess of this over the normal figure being 214 million puds or 71 per cent. He has to admit that the exportation of timber, flax, eggs, butter, naphtha, shows a tendency to increase, but not at a rate sufficient to counter-balance the stationary condition of the corn export. He takes up the question as to the necessity of limiting importation from abroad with regard to iron and steel in order to have a favourable effect upon the trade balance (p. 174) and hence stimulate the development of Russia's industry, but he does not seem to think that this could be carried out in a degree considerable enough to have any effect. His statements as to the 19-pud limit are based upon the Russian edition of the Russian Statistical Committee for 1907, pp. 26-30.

Mr. Pokrovsky, in his previously quoted *Collection of Information*, etc., gives figures, on p. 7 of his introduction, which corroborate these forecasts, although he admits that the figures referring to the period before 1883 are by no means accurate. It is to be noted that the figures refer to 50 governments only.

(1) *Table 72.*

Average of a good harvest = 347 million chetverts,¹ c. 48 million tons exports, = 16 per cent.

Average of a bad harvest = 265 million chetverts, c. 37 million tons exports, = 14 per cent.

Average export per head = 0.60 chetverts = 5.2 puds, 1.7 cwt., in 1895-6 and 1896-7.

(2)

In the 70's there remained for home consumption 2.2 chetverts per head (6.1 cwt.).

¹ One chetvert = 8½ puds.

THE TRADE BALANCE OF RUSSIA. 417

In 80's and beginning of 90's, home consumption 1·9 chetverts per head (5·3 cwt.), *i.e.*, 14 per cent. less.

In 1897, home consumption 1·6 chetverts per head (4·5 cwt.), *i.e.*, only 0·14 of a chetvert, *i.e.*, 1½ lb., higher than the amount for home consumption in the year of scarcity 1891-2.

The author observes on p. 11 that the harvest figures given are probably less than the actual yield; but nevertheless we can trace a continual decrease in consumption below the normal amount, which cannot be taken as an indication of favourable conditions within the country.

THE WAR AND AFTERWARDS.

An interesting table is found in the yearly Customs publication, *General Review*, etc., previously referred to, showing the principal channels through which the trade of Russia flowed prior to the recent war.

General Review for 1913.

Year.		Export and Import according to Frontiers, with Percentage to Total Export and Import.					
		Export.			Import.		
		Europe.	Finland.	Asiatic.	Europe.	Finland.	Asiatic.
1894-98	-	93·7	3·2	3·1	87·7	3·5	8·8
1899-1903	-	90·6	5·0	4·3	86·3	3·6	10·1
1904-08	-	89·4	4·4	6·2	79·9	3·9	16·1
1909-13	-	91·4	3·4	5·2	84·3	3·8	11·9
1913	-	89·8	3·6	6·5	84·7	4·1	11·2
1914	-	84·8	5·8	9·4	79·8	5·7	14·5
1915	-	45·1	33·0	21·9	38·3	21·4	40·3

These figures illustrate several points. In the first place they show quite clearly the very considerable preponderance of trade on the European frontier. Since the economic life of Russia was so inextricably intermingled with that of Europe, it is obvious that the outbreak of war, with the consequent

dislocation of trade, could not but have very serious effects.¹ The difficulty might have been met by special efforts to develop the Finnish and Asiatic frontiers as channels of trade, but this could not be carried out on anything like an adequate scale amid the stress of war conditions. Further complications arose during the war owing to the inability of the transport system to cope with the simultaneous demands of commercial and military needs. By 1920, according to a statement in the first issue of the *Russian Economist* (Journal of the Russian Economic Association in London), transport in Russia, as far as railroads were concerned, had sunk to the level of 1862. This has combined with the cumulative economic effects of the political disturbances, the drought of last summer and the consequent famine in the Volga region, to complete the dislocation of Russia's internal and external trade, the reconstruction of which is one of the many pressing tasks of the future.

MARGARET S. MILLER.

	¹ Imports from Russia.	Exports to Russia.
1912	- £40,538,532	£21,741,486
1913	- 40,270,539	27,693,953
1914	- 28,092,527	21,792,186
1915	- 21,424,998	24,897,288
1916	- 18,251,838	34,330,995
1917	- 17,936,926	52,739,494
1918	- 6,711,320	307,536

The shrinkage of trade with the United Kingdom, which may be taken as typical of Russia's trade with Western Europe, is shown in these figures, taken from the *Annual Statement* for various years. Note the increase of exports up to 1917, but steady decrease of imports.

DIFFICULTIES OF THE EXCHANGE IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

THE rapid rise of the Czechoslovak crown on the international markets reacted in Czechoslovakia in a particularly incisive manner, owing to the fact that the country relies upon export, not only for the greater part of its industrial manufactures (especially textiles, glass, porcelain, agricultural and other machinery, and sugar), but also to a considerable extent in respect of its natural produce (timber, barley and malt, hops, coal). Czechoslovakia, however, could not satisfy its requirements merely by a temporary restriction in manufacture, or by retaining the manufactured goods in stock (which, though difficult, would have constituted only a temporary handicap), because without exports it would be unable to obtain certain indispensable imports from abroad, especially cotton, wool, high-grade coal, supplementary cereals as foodstuffs, as well as certain metals, gum, etc. Czechoslovakia is firmly wedged into the international economic system, and hence any disturbance in the working of this system affects it much more seriously than states whose extensive territories or colonial possessions could provide them with at least a temporary substitute for their international trade.

The foreign observer might suppose that the difficulties arising from this rise in the exchange value of the Czechoslovak crown cannot last long, because he takes into account a uniform valuation of the exchange, the logical consequence of which is a reduction of prices paid for export articles on the one hand, and a corresponding reduction of internal working expenses on the other, thus producing an adjustment on both sides of the trade balance which would make it possible to continue export trade. But such is not the case in the Czechoslovak Republic, or in any other of the countries where the valuation of the exchange has not become disassociated from the basis of a metal currency. These particular conditions at the present time are due partly to the extent of the inflation, partly also to the facility with which speculative currency transactions can be carried out, and the shifting of values upon the international markets, in contrast to the much more gradual pace of the internal economic life of the country. Further factors are the perplexity of business

men as to conditions both in the old and in the new states of the Continent since the great upheaval, and also the enormous amount of currency speculation which is uncovered by any real assets. If to this we add the existing international commitments, uncertain as regards amount, basis and repayment, the contracting of substantial international credits which suddenly transfer considerable sums of money from one state to another, various cases of fluctuation between restricted and unrestricted trade, and, finally, the uncertainty of the political situation, we are faced with adequate reasons why the exchange problem exhibits special conditions of its own.

These special conditions are due partly to the preponderantly speculative character of the international currency market, which, moreover, is subject to violent oscillations, and partly to the discrepancy between the valuation of the unit of currency on the international markets and its purchasing power at home. If the unit of currency sinks rapidly on the international markets, its purchasing power at home does not sink in the same degree, and the export trade of the state concerned is provided with an opportunity for dumping in the states with unimpaired or less impaired currencies, while its import trade is fundamentally restricted and imported articles are expensive on the home markets. If the movement is in the opposite direction, the purchasing power of the currency unit at home does not rise with equal rapidity, with the result that the export trade is hampered, because the cost of production has hitherto been high, while the imported articles are immoderately cheap, so that the home producers, whose expenses are high, cannot compete with them. It is thus obvious that, although the rise of a currency on the international market is politically a favourable sign, and is also an indication of a certain economic prestige (reducing, as it does, the home equivalents of all obligations in foreign currencies), it is, nevertheless, necessarily accompanied by serious disturbances in the economics of the particular state affected.

We must also trace these phenomena in their bearings upon the economic conditions in Czechoslovakia. In March 1919 the Czechoslovak crown was quoted at Zürich at about 30. At the beginning of April it sank to 25, rose in May to 34, while by September it had sunk to below 14. In the course of the latter month it rose to 21·5, gradually sank by the end of January 1920 to about 5·5, and after a temporary recovery to 14 in May, by July 1921 it was moving in the neighbourhood of 8. It then gradually sank till, by the end of October, it was nearly

THE EXCHANGE IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA. 421

at 5, and from that time onwards it gradually advanced, exhibiting a rapid increase to 19 in the middle of 1922, its present position being between 17 and 18.

It will be readily understood that the conditions prevailing in 1920 and 1921 considerably enhanced export as compared with import trade, and this will be seen from the figures issued by the Czechoslovak Statistical Office. The amounts in the following table are reckoned according to *quantity* :—

		Exports.		Imports.	
		Million quintals.	No. of articles (in millions).	Million quintals.	No. of articles (in millions).
During the year	1921...	69·0	2·6	39·1	·3
" "	1922—				
January	6·9	·3	3·0	—
February	4·3	·4	2·4	—
March	9·3	·4	3·8	·1

The figures in respect of the *values* were less favourable because, owing to the falling tendency of the Czechoslovak crown, the export goods were underestimated, and the import goods overestimated. Even so, we can reckon with a credit balance both for 1921 and 1922.

The rapid advance of the crown had a disturbing effect upon these conditions, so that at the present time sawn timber is the only commodity which can still be successfully exported. Textile goods, iron, and agricultural machinery are expensive for export, and the same applies to leather goods, and even the sale of sugar is attended with difficulties.

It may here be pointed out what were the special reasons for the fluctuation in the Czechoslovak crown which finally led to so considerable an under-estimate. Undoubtedly the general factors mentioned above contributed towards this effect, but there were also special reasons.

In the first place there was the purely formal aspect of the matter. As the Czechoslovak crown was fundamentally derived from the Austro-Hungarian banknotes, the chief denominations of which it retained, the speculators naturally looked for some definite connection with the unstamped Austro-Hungarian banknotes, and thus, at the beginning, we see that the exchange movements of the Czechoslovak crown are fairly parallel to those of the Austro-Hungarian or Austrian crown. As time went on, however, and the collapse of the Austrian currency became a matter of general knowledge, the Czechoslovak crown was no longer considered in this connection.

Then there was the technical aspect of the matter. On the

Viennese Bourse the quotation of foreign currencies had depended upon the rates in Berlin and Frankfurt, and in the same way the rates quoted in Czechoslovakia were for a long time obtained by computations based on German marks. Accordingly, the Czechoslovak banking establishments, as far as possible, made use of their former trade connections with Germany, all the more so because the bankers of the Entente countries manifested little knowledge or interest in the matter. Intensive labour was needed before this drawback could be overcome, and this demanded a great deal of time. Meanwhile, however, the economic activities of the country could not remain at a standstill, and Czechoslovakia, therefore, satisfied its requirements wherever it could. Moreover, a considerable part of Czechoslovak export trade was dealt with via Hamburg and Germany in general, as well as via Vienna, the latter transactions being also based on the German mark as a unit. Then there was a considerable amount of speculation in the German mark by those industrialists in Czechoslovakia who were of German nationality. A connection between the Czechoslovak crown and the German mark was thus established, and much emancipatory endeavour was needed before Czechoslovakia was extricated from this very close attachment last year.

This emancipation was a natural condition for the independent development of the Czechoslovak crown on the international market, and rendered possible its independent advance. The advance itself was due to political and economic reasons, and, in part, to speculation. As regards the political reasons, reference may be made to the general belief in the firm establishment of the Czechoslovak State, which was fully confirmed by the successful mobilisation when the ex-Emperor Karl made his unsuccessful attempt to recover the throne of Hungary. Then there were definite successes in foreign policy, notably the solidarity displayed by the Little Entente, and also the markedly pacific tendencies of successive administrations. Not least of all we must take into account the spread of knowledge concerning our State abroad.

Various economic reasons also contributed towards the consolidation of Czechoslovakia, and of her economic relations with other countries. Among such factors may be mentioned the gradual increase in the use of the Czechoslovak crown as a standard of values and a means of payment in export trade transactions, together with the credit trade balance achieved by Czechoslovakia. The circulation of banknotes in Czechoslovakia has not increased, but has, if anything, been reduced. Moreover,

the state has taken active steps to attain financial equilibrium by means of high taxation and a decrease in administrative expenses. In this process there has been a noteworthy development of public transport resources, which are being still further improved. The state, as well as several municipal authorities and private persons, have succeeded in acquiring foreign credits, if not precisely under the most advantageous conditions, nevertheless under tolerably acceptable ones. And the economic mechanism of the state has been consolidated to such a degree that it has been able to grant credits of its own to other countries. For example, it acted as intermediary in making the recent fairly large credit grant to Austria, and negotiations are now proceeding with a view to further credits.

Although Czechoslovakia has not been spared a number of social conflicts, they have mostly been settled by amicable agreement. Thus, where strikes have occurred, they have not been accompanied by those violent outbreaks which took place somewhat frequently in other countries. Land reform, biassed accounts of which have frequently been circulated abroad, is proceeding smoothly and on evolutionary lines.

The exchange value of the Czechoslovak crown was affected also to a considerable extent by speculation. As soon as it showed a marked tendency to advance in value, the numerous speculators in foreign exchanges on the international markets began to abandon the falling mark and the Austrian crown, and to gamble on the rise of the Czechoslovak crown. This tendency was considerably favoured by the circumstance that, owing to the considerable decline or even collapse of the majority of Central European currencies, the Czechoslovak crown is being used as a means of payment, a standard of value and a general basis of transactions in Austria and Germany, and to a certain extent also in Poland, Hungary and a number of other states. For so extensive an area the present issue of banknotes is comparatively small, and this is naturally a factor which favours the rise of the exchange value. On the other hand, this very factor involved also a potential source of fluctuation, which is particularly likely to occur if in any of the above states the present function of the Czechoslovak crown were to be transferred to another medium.

The rapid rise in the exchange value of the Czechoslovak crown, being accompanied by a much slower increase in its purchasing power at home, naturally led to the crisis which has been previously mentioned. In consequence there is an en-

deavour to increase this purchasing power in order to remedy the discrepancy. This endeavour is being supported by the Government, and the reduction of prices is now the cry. The cheaper sale of supplies of goods manufactured at a high price must necessarily involve losses not only as regards the working capital, but also the reserve capital, and this tends to bring down wages still further. By a reduction of state debts contracted in foreign currencies, and of other administrative expenses, the state will derive resources which will enable it to ease the economic situation in various ways. This will be done by reducing the more burdensome forms of taxation, as well as railway rates (as yet the only reduction is upon exported goods in transit). It will also be able to reduce unemployment by public works on a large scale.

In attempting also to protect the sale of native products at home, by restricting the process of dumping from states with impaired currencies, the interests of particular industries must be considered, and moderate protective duties on agricultural produce must be introduced. To this must be added the endeavours to develop further trade agreements such as would secure a more favourable position for Czechoslovak exports abroad, and also to establish the basis for granting long-term credits, which, especially at the present time, would facilitate Czechoslovak competition in foreign countries as long as the Czechoslovak exporters may be in a position to grant credit to foreign importers, as the states competing with Czechoslovakia had been doing for a long time past.

Not the least important of the measures to be undertaken during this period of transition will certainly be a granting of relief to business concerns which, through no fault of their own, have become involved in difficulties in consequence of the vicissitudes of the exchange, and to effect a satisfactory compromise so as to save these concerns from ruin.

The rise of the exchange had one other consequence which is interesting from the point of view of political economy. While hitherto the natural trend of Czechoslovak foreign trade has been towards the East, it is now gravitating no less definitely towards the West. It is true that there are many factors in the present situation which favour the continuance of this westward orientation, but none the less, the more natural outlet for Czechoslovak trade is towards the East, if only because the export of manufactured goods, which constitutes the greater part of all Czechoslovak exports, can find better openings in less industrialised

countries. It is, therefore, very important to guide this transitional tendency into proper channels. For this purpose something more effective than mere trade agreements is needed. The Prague Sample Fairs, which met with considerable response from Jugoslavia and Roumania, aimed in this direction, and there are other similar undertakings with the same end in view, which, though of a private character, are also supported by the Government. In this connection it is essential that the Danube waterway should be developed and rendered accessible. As far as Czechoslovakia is concerned, it is of paramount importance to develop the harbour at Bratislava, to reach a working arrangement regarding the Danube mouths, and to introduce more of private commercial enterprise into Danubian navigation.

Special attention, however, must be devoted to the development of affairs in Russia, where former relations, racial kinship and comparative proximity provide the conditions for great economic development. Altogether the Russian problem is the most urgent question in the world, not only from a political but also from an economic point of view, and the fundamental reason why world-economics do not function as they should, is because this great and important factor is at present out of action, being unable either to import or export.

In judging the conditions and the development of contemporary Russia, it is very profitable to re-read the history of the French Revolution. There are obvious differences, but these are not so much differences of standard between the respective peoples, for the French peasant at the end of the XVIIIth century was not more advanced in cultural matters than the broad masses of the population of Russia to-day. There are only two fundamental differences: on the one hand, the broad masses of the Russian nation have no strongly developed national sentiment, while, on the other hand, the dimensions there are vast. Nevertheless, from the analogy with the French Revolution we can at least infer that by economic measures alone it is not possible to achieve great political successes in Russia (we need only recall the history of Napoleon's Continental blockade): and therefore neither the overthrow of the Soviet Government, nor the changes in the guiding principles of economic policy will prove sufficient.

So long, then, as no movement from within forcibly modifies the present policy of Russia, it will continue to pursue its own course. Whether this will lead to absolutism or oligarchy, or whether it will assume a more democratic aspect, cannot be foretold. It is certain, however, that in economic matters the general

movement of Russia will be towards conditions favouring the vital interests and the economic prosperity of the broad masses of the people. No judicious economic policy on the part of human society, which itself is so complicated a phenomenon, can be built up upon a single economic principle: but modern times have demonstrated beyond a doubt that the foundation which provides the whole structure with its distinguishing character may either be economic liberalism, socialistic collectivism, or the co-operative system. It therefore by no means necessarily follows that Russian conditions, if left to themselves, will lapse into chaos.

If then the other states which have various interests in Russia do not regard political or military intervention there as either possible or desirable, it is difficult to see what is to prevent Russia from resuming her activities as a customer in the world's markets, at first, of course, on the basis of long-term credits; and in view of her unlimited possibilities, these activities should soon include also the delivery of goods. Whether the means towards this end should be immediate official recognition and a trade agreement or whether at the outset it should be left entirely to private economic intercourse, is a political question which cannot be dealt with here. The actual method does not change the economic aspect of the problem.

If this restoration of Russia as a factor in international commerce could be achieved, it would certainly result in a fundamental improvement of the economic crisis now prevailing throughout the world, and the remaining economic conflicts would then shift into the background. I think that it would only be in keeping with their past history, if the Czechs were to concentrate their efforts upon this task, rather than leave it to other states, whose interests are diametrically opposed to theirs.

What view are we to take of the situation brought about by the advance of the Czechoslovak crown? We certainly cannot admit the possibility of adjusting matters by some artificial reduction of the Czechoslovak crown to a lower level. Such a method would be irrational, for the political and economic factors referred to above would sooner or later raise the Czechoslovak currency again. As in other states with a depreciated currency, the losses must be squarely faced, and action must be taken to alleviate the consequences and render a settlement as easy as possible. Economic life must be adjusted to the more settled conditions which govern economic development, now that the economic confusion of the war and the

period immediately following it is gradually dying down. practice things are hardly likely to be worse than in the days when every article was estimated by a huge pile of paper notes. But the proper functioning of the economic life of all states (not only of ours) can only be expected, when world-economics, in which at the present day we are all involved, and on the foundations of which we have constructed our own economic system, have again achieved more satisfactory conditions.

It is true that there have been proposals for solving our own currency questions also by an international method. The idea is a tempting one, but the history of the Latin monetary union shows that a uniform currency principle does not necessarily produce a uniform currency. Moreover, the modern credit proposals very closely resemble an economic control exercised by the strongest (and in a monetary sense this could only be the United States of America) over all the rest. It is precisely this circumstance which militates against their acceptance even on the part of those European states which are the strongest from an economic point of view.

JOSEF DRACHOVSKÝ.

THE POLISH PEASANTS.¹ (I.)

(*From the Polish of W. S. Reymont.*)

THE FIGHT BETWEEN THE PEASANTS OF LIPCE AND THE SQUIRE'S MEN.

THE world was still numbed with the cold of night, it was full of a drowsy stillness, and enveloped in chill and glassy mists.

Silence lay over the forests, sharply the cold cut through the air, and a faint glimmer of dawn reddened the tree-tops and fell here and there on the pale snows.

Only from the "Wolves' Hollows" came the thud of trees falling one by one, the ring of axes and the screech of saws.

They were felling the wood! . . .

More than forty sturdy men had been at work since daybreak. It was as though a swarm of woodpeckers had alighted on the forest, and clung to the trees, and were pecking away now resolutely and furiously. Trees fell one after another, the clear space increased, the overthrown giants of the wood lay prostrate like a field of trodden corn, and only here and there, like stiff thistles, the slender saplings remained—bending down like weeping women over the fallen; here and there half-cut shrubs rustled, or some miserable, dwarfish tree, not touched by the axe, trembled fearfully. And everywhere on the quilts of trodden snow, as though on shrouds, lay fallen trees, heaps of branches, dead tree-tops, and mighty trunks, like stripped and mutilated corpses; while streamlets of yellow saw-dust were trickling about through the snow, as it were the pitiful blood of the forest.

And all round the clearing, as over an open grave, there stood the wood, a serried, lofty, impenetrable mass, like friends, relations, and acquaintances gathered in a throng, bending in anxious silence, repressing a cry of despair, listening as their kinsfolk fell to their death, and gazing, horror-stricken, at the pitiless harvesting.

¹ In this number and in No. 3 we publish two chapters from W. S. Reymont's novel, "The Peasants" (*Ciżopi*), which appeared at Warsaw in 1914, in 4 volumes, entitled, "Autumn: Winter: Spring: Summer."—ED.

For the woodcutters advanced unceasingly. They spread out in a broad column, and slowly and silently pushed their way on into the forest—the forest which seemed invincible and blocked their way with a gloomy, lofty wall of serried trunks, and overshadowed them with its hugeness so that they disappeared in the darkness of the branches. Only the axes glittered in the gloom and hewed untiringly; the screech of the saws never ceased even for a little space. Ever and anon some tree tottered, and suddenly, like a bird treacherously caught in the toils, it broke loose from its fellows, beat about with its branches, and fell down, with mortal moan, on the ground—and after it another, and a third, and a tenth. . . .

Huge pines, green with age, were falling; and firs clad in homespun, and spruces with widespread arms, and grey oaks, overgrown with beards of hoary moss—like old men whom thunders had not crushed and hundreds of years had not broken, till at last the axe laid them low. And many other trees were falling, less noble—who will tell them all by name and number!

The wood was dying with moans, trees were falling heavily like warriors pressed by the foe and pushed one by another, unyielding, sturdy, but beaten down with invincible power, so that they will never even cry out “O God!” before they fall in a row and sink to death.

Only their moan resounded through the wood, the earth shook unceasingly with felled trees, the axes went on striking, the grating sound of the saws continued, and the rustle of branches stirred the air like a dying sigh.

Hours passed; new swathes of cut trees covered the clearing, and the work did not cease.

The magpies clamoured as they clung to the saplings; again, a swarm of rooks would pass, cawing over this field of death, or some forest animal would emerge from the thickets, stop on their fringe and long run its glassy eyes over the tangled smokes of the fires, over the fallen trees—till at last, seeing men, it fled, howling.

And the men worked furiously, eating their way into the forest, like wolves into a herd of sheep, when they overtake it, and it huddles together, and, paralysed with deadly fear, bleating now and again, waits till the last lamb falls under the fangs of the aggressors.

Only after breakfast, when the sun had risen so high that the rime began to fall in drops, and golden spiders of light crept through the wood, somebody heard a far-off tumult.

"A crowd is coming," one of the woodcutters said, putting his ear to a tree.

Indeed, the noise came nearer and grew more distinct. From all sides cries were heard, and a muffled beat of many feet, and the time for one short prayer had scarcely passed before a sledge was dimly seen on the road running from the village. In the sledge there stood old Boryna, and behind him, on horseback, on carts, and on foot, there swarmed into sight a dense crowd of women, boys, and striplings, and all raising a fierce cry, began to run towards the woodcutters.

Boryna jumped down from the sledge and ran in front of the crowd; behind him others, each where he could squeeze in; some had sticks, some brandished pitchforks threateningly, some were clutching flails with clenched fist, some flashing scythes, and some carried only boughs of trees. As for the women, they had only their nails for weapons, and their shouting. And they all bore down upon the terrified woodcutters.

"Don't cut the wood! Hands off the forest! The wood is ours, we won't let you!" All cried at once, so that nobody could understand what they wanted, until old Boryna came up close to the terror-stricken band of woodcutters and roared so that the whole wood echoed:

"Men from Modlica, from Rzepki, and wherever else you may be from! Hear me!"

There was silence, and he cried again:

"Take with you what is yours and go in God's name; we forbid you to stay, and whoever doesn't obey us, will have to do with all our people."

They did not resist, because fierce faces, pitchforks, flails, and such a multitude of people, all angry and ready to fight, filled them with fear. So they began to talk among themselves and draw together, sticking the axes behind their belts, collecting the handsaws, and gathering for departure—not without some angry growls, however, particularly those of Rzepki, as they were of gentry stock and had had neighbours' quarrels with those of Lipce time out of mind. They cursed them aloud, then they clattered their axes, they threatened; but, willy-nilly, they had to retreat before such a show of force, the Lipce people shouting at them menacingly, pressing in upon them, and pushing them on into the forest.

Others bustled about the clearing, putting out the fires, and pulling down the piled-up blocks of sawn wood. The women, with old Kozłowa in front, seeing the plank-sheds on the

border of the clearing, made a rush for them and began to tear them to pieces and scatter the boards about the woods, so that there should be no trace left.

But old Boryna, seeing the woodcutters had retired so easily, called the farmers together and was persuading them to go in a body up to the Manor at once and tell the Squire that he must not dare touch the wood as long as the Courts of Law did not restore what belonged of right to the peasants. Yet before they came to an understanding, before they had made up their minds what they had best do, the women raised a cry and began to run confusedly away from the sheds, for a dozen horsemen had ridden out of the wood and were bearing down upon them.

The Manor—informed of what had happened—was coming to the rescue of the woodcutters.

The Steward was there on horseback, heading a body of mounted Manor servants. They cantered sharply into the clearing and, overtaking the women, began to lash them with their whips; the Steward, a big man of ox-like stature, was the first to lay about with his lash, and he shouted :

“ Lousy thieves ! Give it ’em with the whips, boys ! Bind ’em, to prison with ’em ! ”

“ Come here ! Come round me all, don’t let ’em beat you ! ” Boryna bellowed out in his turn. For his people were already scattering in fright.

But at his voice they stopped, and regardless of the lashes that were raining down on so many, they covered their heads with their hands and ran towards the old man, to rally round him.

“ Have at ’em with your sticks ! Have at the horses with your flails ! ” the old man shouted fiercely, and catching up a pole he went foremost for the assailants and struck out at random. Behind him, like a forest swept by a wind of fury, the peasants bore down in serried ranks, shoulder to shoulder, flail to flail, pitchfork to pitchfork, and with one huge shout they rushed upon the Manor servants, belabouring them as best they could till the wood resounded with the blows as though somebody were husking peas with a stick on the floor.

Inhuman shrieks arose, and curses ; injured horses neighed piercingly, wounded men moaned, while the thud of beating sticks went on. The snorting breath of wrestling men and wild cries of alarm shook the air of the battlefield.

The Manor men resisted bravely, they cursed and struck out no worse than the peasants, but they became confused at last and began to retire, because the horses, hit with flails, were rearing.

screeching, turning, shying. The Steward, perceiving what was happening, gave the spur to his bay horse and jumped right into the middle of a whole crowd of peasants, where Boryna stood ; but that was the last that was seen of him, for at once there was a whirr of flails, blows rained down upon him, a swarm of hands caught him on all sides and tore him out of the saddle, so that he flew up into the air like a weed dug up at the root and fell down into the snow under their feet. It was all Boryna could do to shield him and drag him, senseless, into a safe place.

Then, all was in a welter, as when a sudden gust of wind strikes into piles of corn and mixes them up so that there is only one inextricable tangle, and then rolls them over the field and turns them about through the furrows. A terrible cry arose, and there was such a whirl of confusion that nothing more could be seen but weltering heaps of men on the snow, and fists thrashing furiously. Sometimes a man tore himself out of the struggle and ran like mad, but he soon turned, and, with new shouts and new fury, rushed into the thick of the combat.

They were fighting man to man, and in groups, they wrestled holding on to each other round the shoulders or by the neck, they pressed each other down with their knees, they tore the flesh open ; but neither could as yet get the upper hand of the others, because the Manor servants had jumped down from their horses and did not give way by a foot's breadth : for help was constantly arriving for them : the woodcutters had taken their side and were pressing on strenuously. First among them, the men of Rzepki, in a body, grimly and silently, like fierce dogs, had thrown themselves into the fray on their side ; and all were led by the forester, who had appeared at the last moment. Being a man known throughout the whole neighbourhood for his strength, and quarrelsome besides, and having accounts of his own to settle with the men of Lipce, he rushed about, foremost of all, attacking whole troops of them single-handed. He broke heads with the butt of his gun ; he drove them all apart, and lashed out wildly at them so that it was a pity to behold.

Stacho Płoszka went for him to make a stand against him because the peasants were already beginning to run away from him : but the forester caught him by the neck, whirled him round in the air, and threw him down on the ground like a threshed-out sheaf. Stacho fell senseless. Again, one of the Wachniks jumped up to him and dealt him a blow over the shoulder with his flail, but he got a back-hand blow himself with

the fist between the eyes, and he only spread out his arms and cried "Jesus!" and fell to the ground.

At last, Matthew could not hold back any longer, and he, too, rushed at the forester. But though Anthony Boryna's match in strength, and he the strongest man in the village, Matthew did not hold out so much as for a short prayer's time: the forester overcame him, beat him down, rolled him about in the snow and made him run, while he himself made his way towards old Boryna, who in the middle of a group was at grips with a party of Rzepki men. But before the forester had got close to Boryna, the women, with shrieks, had overrun him, caught him with their nails, clutched at his shock of hair, entangled him and bent him toward the ground, and were dragging him about—just as curs, when they attack a sheep-dog, snap at his fur with their fangs and drag him hither and thither.

By this time, the peasants were getting the upper hand. They had got crowded and mixed up like leaves in a whirlwind. Each had seized on his man, and was throttling him and wallowing about with him in the snow, while women were clutching at men from the side and pulling them by the hair.

The uproar, the confusion, the tussle, were such that men scarcely knew those of their own side from the others. But finally the peasants overcame the squire's men. Some of these were already lying about in their blood, and others were tired out and weak by now, and were stealthily running off into the wood. Only the woodcutters fought on with the remnant of their strength, and sometimes even they asked for mercy: but the people being even more infuriated against them than against those of the Manor, and burning with rage like a torch in the wind, no prayers were heard, none took heed—all struck out with might and main.

They had thrown away their sticks, their flails, their pitchforks, and come to grips closely, powerfully, man to man and fist to fist and strength to strength: they were pressing and smothering each other, tearing each other, and rolling each other about on the ground. Even the shouts had died down, and only hoarse and heavy breathings were heard, and curses, and wrestlings.

A Judgment Day had come which there is no describing. Men had gone almost mad, fury was casting them about and rage carrying them like a horse. Kobus and the woman, Kozłowa, evidently had gone crazy altogether; it was a horror to behold them bleeding, beaten all over, and yet attacking whole bunches of men.

So they still struggled with each other, and cries ever louder rose again on the part of the Lipce peasants, because the pursuit of the flying had begun, and isolated men were now being hit about by small groups. But then, the forester at last shook off the women. Badly hurt, and therefore all the more furious, he began to call his men together, and, seeing old Boryna, he jumped up to him, they caught hold of each other, twisted their mighty arms round each other like bears, and began to wrestle, and drag each other about, and strike against trees, because they had got well into the forest.

Upon this Anthony, Boryna's son, came running up. He had come late. He only stopped for a moment at the border of the clearing to catch breath, and soon saw what was happening to his father.

He rolled his hawk's eyes about—nobody was looking at them—all were in such combat and confusion that he knew not one single face. So he retired, stealthily got round, close to where old Boryna was fighting the forester, and stopped a few paces off, behind a tree.

The forester was getting the upper hand. It was hard work. He was mortally tired, and the old man was holding out stoutly. They were down on the ground, both, wallowing about like two fighting dogs, striking the earth with each other's bodies. But the old man was the more often undermost now. He had lost his sheepskin cap, and his grey head was knocking against the roots of the trees.

Anthony cast another look about him, drew his gun from under his sheepskin, cowered down, crossed himself unconsciously, and aimed at his father's head.¹ But before he had pulled the trigger, both wrestlers were on their feet again. Anthony also rose and laid the gun to his cheek . . . But he did not fire : a sudden, terrible fear had contracted his heart, he could scarcely breathe, his hands were moving as in a fever, he shook all over, a darkness came before his eyes, and he was seized with such a fit of dizziness that he stood there for a long while without knowing what was the matter with him . . . Suddenly, a frightful cry was heard :

“ Help, men ! Help . . . ! ”

The forester had just struck Boryna over the head with the butt of his gun. The blood gushed forth ; the old man, with one piercing cry, threw up his hands and fell to the ground like a log.

¹ Father and son were rivals in love.—ED.

Anthony came to in a moment, cast away his gun, and jumped to his father's side. The old man lay still : there was a rattle in his throat, as of a dying man. Blood was streaming over his face—his head was nearly broken in two—he was still alive—but his eyes were growing dim—he was beating the ground with his heels.

"Father! Jesu mine! Father!"—the son roared in a voice of horror. He caught the old man up in his hands, pressed him to his breast, and began to cry with a voice fit to rend the heavens :

"Father! They've killed him! Killed him!" He howled as a bitch howls when men have drowned her puppies.

Some men who were near him, heard and came up to help. They laid the old man down on boughs, and began to put snow to his head, and tried to help as best they could. Anthony sat down on the ground, he was tearing his hair and kept crying wildly : "They've killed him! Killed him!" until they thought his wits had suddenly left him.

But then he all at once stopped crying, remembered everything and rushed at the forester with a terrific shout and with such madness in his eyes that the forester was frightened and ran. But feeling he would be overtaken, he turned sharply round and fired on Anthony point-blank, aiming straight at his breast. By some miracle, however, he did not hit him, he only singed his face, and Anthony fell upon him like lightning.

Vainly did the forester defend himself, vainly did he try to escape, vainly did he even ask mercy in despair and mortal fear—Anthony caught him in his claws like an enraged wolf, lifted him up on high and knocked him about against the trees until the man had drawn his last breath.

And then he seemed to forget himself and no longer to know what he did. He rushed into the midst of the fight, and wherever he appeared hearts sickened with fear, men ran in horror, for he was terrible—splashed with his father's blood and his own, bare-headed, his hair glued to his brow with sweat, livid as a corpse, fearsome and so inhumanly strong that almost by himself he overcame and beat down the rest of those who still resisted, until his own people at last had to calm him and keep him back, for he would have beaten to death all around him.

The fight was over. The men of Lipce, though hurt and bleeding, were filling the wood with joyful shouts.

The women attended those more grievously wounded, and took them to the sledges. There were not a few of them. One of the Kłebiaks had a broken arm ; Andrew Pacześ had a leg smashed and could not walk, and cried with pain when they

carried him; Kobus was knocked about so cruelly that he could not move; Matthew was vomiting blood and complaining of his back, and others had suffered no less, so that there was not one who had come out of it whole. But having won the victory, they did not care about their injuries, but shouted merrily and loudly, and were making ready to go home.

Boryna was laid on a sledge, and the sledge was driven slowly. They feared he would die on the way. He was insensible, and, from under the rags with which his wound was dressed, blood was flowing continually into his eyes, and all down his face. He was as pale as a shroud, and looked just like a dead man.

Anthony was walking by the side of the sledge and looking with horror into his father's face. He held up his head at rough places of the road and, now and again, muttered in a still voice of prayer and of pity :

"Father! In God's name! Father!"

The men walked in loose order, by groups, each making his way as he could, through the wood, for down the middle of the road the sledges with the wounded were passing. One and another moaned and wailed, but the rest laughed aloud, shouting merrily and uproariously. They began to tell stories to each other, to boast of their feats and to mock at the vanquished; here and there songs burst forth, then again a shout shook the forest, and everybody was drunk with triumph, so that some even staggered against trees or stumbled on the roots.

Few felt the blows and the fatigue, for all hearts were elated with the unspeakable joy of victory, all men were full of glee and felt so strong that, let oppose them who would, they would grind him to dust—they would stand up against the world!

They walked on stoutly and noisily, rolling their flaming eyes over the conquered forest, which shook its branches over their heads, rustling sleepily, and dropping dewy rime upon them, as though it were sprinkling them with its tears.

Suddenly, Boryna opened his eyes, and looked at Anthony for a long time as if he did not believe his own eyes, until at last a profound, tranquil joy lit up his face, he moved his lips several times, and whispered with supreme effort :

"Is it you, my son? Is it you?"

And then he fainted again.

(Translated by R. Dyboski.)

POEMS.

TWO FABLES OF KRYLOV.

Translated from the Russian by Bernard Pares.

[*The first of these fables is quoted, with an application to the Russian Intelligentsia, by Mr. Shulgin in his article (see p. 380). The second might be suggested by the contrast which he makes between Stolypin and Stürmer.*]

GADFLY AND ANT.¹

Sporting, frisking, gadding fly
Warbled all the summer through :
Scarce had time to turn her eye :—
There stands winter, full in view.
Now the fields lie bleak and dead—
All those days of sunshine fled,
When she found 'neath every blade
Bed and breakfast ready made.
Winter falls, and gone is plenty ;
Cold and hunger spread their wings ;
Now no more the gadfly sings ;
Where's the joy that singing brings,—
Singing when the stomach's empty ?
Moping, mumbling all the day,
To the ant she crawls her way.
Take me in now, there's a dear !
I shall soon get stronger here ;
Till the spring is on the wood,
Keep me warm and give me food !
“ Friend, but that seems odd to me ;
Do you mean you did not see
Summer's work makes winter good ? ”
“ Where could time for that be found ?
In the silky grass our bower—
Singing, sporting hour by hour,
Playing till my head went round.”
“ So you—— ? ” “ So I did not care ;
All day long I sang my ditty.”
“ Sang your ditty ? Lor', how pretty !
Now you're free to dance out there.”

IVAN KRYLOV.

¹ The original word is “ Dragon-fly.”

TWO DOGS.

A faithful farmyard hound,
 That served his master well the whole year round,
 A long-lost friend espied with joy;
 It was the curly spaniel Toy,
 On downy cushion soft in window niche reclining.
 As if it were a sister he had found,
 He almost weeps for joy, and pining, whining,
 Against the wall he scratches and he scrambles,
 And wags his tail and gambols.
 "Well, Toy dear, tell me how you fare
 Since Master took you in, to live with him up there?
 Out here we often starved, you've not forgotten how;
 Say, what's the job you're doing now?"
 "'Twere wicked to complain," says Toy;
 "I'm sure I'm Master's only joy;
 I live in luxury and state;
 I eat and drink off silver plate,
 And play on Master's lap, and when that fancy's gone,
 The sofa and the floor are nice to roll upon.
 What's happening with you?" "I?" says the honest hound,—
 His tail was hanging limp, his muzzle near the ground:
 "I'm just as used to cold, as when we both were younger,—
 And hunger;
 And over Master's house still keeping guard,
 I sleep and drench with rain out yonder in the yard;
 And when I bark, I get a kick,
 Or else the stick!
 But how did you on such good fortune fall,
 You, who are only weak and small,
 While I slave out my soul, and all in vain?
 Say, what's your job?" "My job! That's good! Say that
 again!"
 Cries little Toy, and sniggles up her jaws;
 "I walk on my hind paws."
 And many a fortune had no other cause!
 The man could only walk on his hind paws.

I. KRYLOV.

AN EXILE'S HYMN AT SUNSET ON THE SEA.

From the Polish of JULIUS SLOWACKI.

Translated by Frank H. Fortey.

I grieve, O God! For my sake in the west,
 Thou spread'st the rainbow streaming bright and far :
 Beneath my feet, in azure waters drest,
 Thou hid'st a fiery star ;
 Though sky and sea a lovely crimson are :
 I grieve, O God !

Just as an infant with sad, wistful gaze
 Bends o'er the mother whose dear life is done,
 So bend I o'er the last, long, level rays
 Of the half-sunken sun ;
 Although his daily course he'll always run :
 I grieve, O God !

An upright corn-ear with a poor, lean head—
 I stand with joyless, discontented eyes ;
 'Fore men, may quietude my face o'erspread—
 The quiet of the skies ;
 But before Thee, my heart's deep . . . open lies :
 I grieve, O God !

Whilst widely straying o'er the ocean vast,
 Where league on league of endless billows flow,
 To-day, a flock of storks came flying past,
 Ranged in a single row ;
 I saw them once in Poland long ago :
 So grieve, O God !

Alas ! So oft I've brooded over graves ;
 So dimly I remember my own home ;
 Am so like the poor wanderer who braves
 Lightning and haily foam.
 Where is my Grave . . . Rest, when I'll cease to roam . . .
 And grieve, O God !

Alas ! . . . My bleachèd bones shall find no room
 Beneath the guard of churchyard monument ;

I almost envy—when I see a tomb—
 The dust, where all are blent;
 I have an unknown grave—my banishment.
 I grieve, O God!

In my Home-land, an innocent young child
 Prays for me daily; but alas! I *know*
 My barque sails no more home, but o'er a wild,
 Strange sea must ever go;
 That children's prayers—and tears—should fruitless flow;
 I grieve, O God!

At the bright rainbow, which Thy Angels spread
 So gloriously great in yonder sky,
 Others, when I a hundred years am dead,
 Looking . . . will die;
 Until—at length—my “dust to dust” will lie:
 I'll grieve, O God!

THE DEATH OF IVO

A Croat Ballad.¹

Translated by R. W. Seton-Watson.

A dream has dreamt	the mother of Ivo.
Darkness she saw	fall upon Senj,
The clear heavens	burst asunder,
The shimmering moon	fell down to earth,
On the Church of St. Rose,	in the midst of Senj.
And the stars were swept	across the sky,
And the dawn rose up	all red with blood,
And the cuckoo bird	she heard a-calling,
In the midst of Senj,	on Senj's white church.

¹ The essential fact about Serbo-Croat ballad poetry is that it is recitative, originally chanted to the accompaniment of the one-stringed *gusla*. A translation, then, if it is to reproduce the spirit of the original, must first and foremost lend itself to recitation. With this aim I have adopted the unusual method of marking the caesura by a gap in the middle of the line. Serbo-Croat, by its peculiarly fine musical cadences, avoids the monotony into which our own octosyllabic and decasyllabic verse is so apt to fall; and my device for preserving this is to take perhaps undue liberties of rhythm on either side of the caesura.—P. W. S. W.

When from her dream
Her staff she took
And went forthwith
And there she told
Told him all

And when the old man
'Twas thus he did
"Hear me, O hear me,
" 'Twas an evil dream,
" That darkness fell
" It is that desolate
" That the clear heavens
" And the shimmering moon
" It is that thine Ivo
" That the stars were swept
" It is that many

" That the dawn rose up
" It is that thou
" That the cuckoo bird
" It is that the Turks
" And me in my old age

While that the old man
Lo, Ivo of Senj
His coal black steed
Seventeen
His right hand
He pressed his steed
Then to his aged
" Help me, mother,
" Bathe me my wounds
" And give the chalice

Swiftly then
Helped him down
And bathed his wounds
And poured him out
Then did his aged
" Son, how didst thou fare
And thus made answer
" Well did we fare
" Captives enough
" And yet more treasure

the dame awakened,
in her right hand,
to St. Rose's Church;
the Archpriest Nedeljko,
that she had dreamed.

had heard her out,
expound the dream :
aged mother !
and worse shall befall.
on the town of Senj,
it shall remain.

burst asunder
fell down to earth
is to die.
across the sky,
a widow shall be.

all red with blood,
shalt be left to weep.
by St. Rose's sang,
shall plunder it,
they shall slay."

still was speaking,
stood there before them.
was bathed in blood,
were the wounds of Ivo.
in his left he bore.
to the white church door,
mother he cried :
from off my steed,
with water cold,
to my hand."

did his mother obey,
from his foaming steed,
with water cold,
the red, red wine.
mother ask him :
in Italy ? "

Ivo her son :
in Italy.
did we take, my mother
we did find :

" Then hale and blithe
 " So when our first
 " A foremost band
 " Black were the horses,
 " Black were the turbans
 " Forthwith upon them
 " Of *them* not one
 " Of *us* not one
 " So when our second
 " A second band
 " White were the horses,
 " White were the turbans
 " Forthwith upon them
 " Of *us* not one
 " Of *them* not one
 " So when our third
 " Another band
 " Black were their mantles,
 " Forthwith upon them
 " Scorched were their legs
 " And fiercely then
 " Of them, my mother
 " Of us, my mother
 " Not one, save only
 " And him thou seest
 " Bearing his right hand

Thus spake he,
 Thus said his say
 He died, and left
 God grant to him
 To us, my brothers,

we homeward turned.
 night's stage we reached,
 upon us fell.
 black the heroes,
 on their heads.
 we gave fire.
 was left, my mother,
 did fall, my mother.
 stage was reached,
 upon us fell.
 whiter the heroes.
 on their heads.
 we gave fire.
 did fall, my mother
 was left, my mother.
 night's stage was reached,
 upon us fell.
 long their muskets,
 we gave fire,
 to the very knees.
 the fight began.
 not one did fall.
 not one was left—
 Ivo thy son,
 stricken of wounds,
 in his left ! "

as his spirit struggled,
 and softly passed.
 his grieving mother,
 in Heaven his dwelling,
 health and joy.

OBITUARY

VLADIMIR NABOKOV.

VLADIMIR DMITRIEVICH NABOKOV was, like S. I. Shidlovsky, connected with the reforming Ministry of Loris-Melikov at the end of the reign of Alexander II. through his father, who was then Minister of Justice. One of his brothers was Procurator-General or highest Law Officer in Warsaw, and another, Constantine, was Councillor and later Chargé d'Affaires of the British Embassy in London.

Vladimir Nabokov, who was for some time a lecturer in the School of Jurisprudence in the University of Petrograd, chose for himself an independent career in the service of Russian Liberalism, of which he was one of the most active and capable promoters, and this of itself cut him off from any chance of an official career. He was prominent in the League of Liberation and in the Zemstvo Congresses of 1905, which led the movement of reform that resulted in the foundation of the Imperial Duma. On these Congresses he acted with the more advanced or Liberal Wing, which gradually became distinctive as a group of Zemstvo Constitutionalists and later formed the right wing of the Constitutional Democratic or Liberal Party (Cadets). In 1906 his outstanding political abilities were shown on a larger scene, that of the First Imperial Duma. The Cadets were at once the most central and the most numerous party; the leadership of the Duma was in their hands, and the tactical leadership of the Cadets was in the main entrusted to Nabokov. Even were the Duma unanimous, it was extremely unlikely that the Government would listen to it, and this made unanimity all the more imperative. Eyewitnesses would not easily forget the part which Nabokov played in the critical debate on the Address to the Throne. The Emperor, instead of coming to the Duma, had summoned it to the Winter Palace, and there delivered to its members a speech which did not outline any policy. The Duma, as conceived by the Government, was to be a faint imitation of the Reichstag; as conceived by its own leaders, it was to take up the position of an English parliament. It was, therefore, decided that as

the Government had proposed no policy, the Duma should propose its own in its answering address to the Throne. These were the first days of the Russian Parliament. It contained a larger proportion of peasants than any other National Assembly, most of whom had been elected without party or programme. The only party at all organised so far was that of the Cadets, and the Duma was therefore divided up into many small groups, including those of non-Russian nationalities, such as the Poles or Musulmans. From this motley assembly, Vladimir Nabokov was able to obtain, at a time of great political excitement, the adoption of a programme which dealt in detail with all the principal needs of the country. I can remember watching him as he moved quietly from one group to another, and could only thus understand why, when he mounted the tribune, the formulæ which he proposed practically in every case met with ready acceptance. The reply of the Ministry of Goremykin was to visit the Duma in state and inform it, in a long lecture from the Premier, that its principal demands were "inadmissible." The lecture was listened to in perfect silence, and the moment it was over Nabokov mounted the tribune and quietly proposed a vote of censure, which was adopted with only a few dissentients. This was the real history of the First Duma; there followed a deadlock and ultimately dissolution. Nabokov was not in favour of the Viborg Manifesto, which most of his colleagues lived to condemn, but he signed it in loyalty to his party and suffered the penalty of exclusion for the future from civic rights, and therefore from further election to the Duma. Facing manfully this check at the opening of a brilliant career, he worked strenuously for Liberalism throughout the duller years that followed and, in particular, helped very much to consolidate the Liberal public by his work in its organ, *Rech*. New opportunities of public activity opened to him during the Great War, and when the Emperor abdicated in 1917 and committed the government of the country to the Duma, Nabokov stepped into his rightful place as Secretary to the Cabinet. The beginnings of social disruption that followed drove him with other Cadets from office, and he saw his life's work ruined for the time by the Bolshevik *coup d'état* of November. He continued to work abroad no less manfully than before to stem the tide of disaster, and was one of the principal political figures in the Russian emigration. In March 1922 he organised in Berlin a welcome to his old friend and colleague, Professor Milyukov, with all the more energy because

of some differences of detail which had arisen in their political views. While Milyukov was addressing a meeting, a man in the audience shot at him, and Nabokov rushed forward from the platform, covering Milyukov with his person, and fell shot through the heart. The murder was the act of Russian reactionaries, who received stern punishment from a German court. Thus Russia uses up those few gifted and devoted men who have fought their way past all obstacles to an experience which can qualify them for political leadership. The tragedy of such an end is deepened by the fact that, in the programme of liberation for Russia, Nabokov had specially concentrated himself on the abolition of capital punishment.

B. P.

SERGIUS SHIDLOVSKY.

SERGIUS Iliodorovich Shidlovsky was born on March 16, 1861, within a month of the central date in the history of Russia, the edict of Alexander II. which emancipated the peasants from serfdom. This date might have served as a motto for his whole life. Coming of a family honourable in the service of Russia, destined himself alike by family tradition and character for a career of disinterested public service, mated later in one of the happiest of marriages with the daughter of Saburov, who had served Alexander II. as one of the very few Liberal Ministers of Education whom Russia has known, Sergius Shidlovsky, after being educated at the Alexandrovsky Lycée, and discharging his military service, devoted himself to the responsibilities of a large landowner in the province of Voronezh. Here he did everything in his power to lighten the burdens of the peasants, assisting them in every way, by counsel, example and material help, to help themselves. He took a prominent part in the work of the neighbouring district zemstvo of Valuiki, at a time when zemstvo work all over Russia offered the best opportunities of public service and was the enthusiasm of so many of the best minds among the gentry and the professional class. One of the foremost zemstva in Russia at this time was that of Shidlovsky's province Voronezh, and here he was a colleague of Andrew Shingarev, who did so much to systematise the sanitary provision of the province. At this time the Peasants' Bank, after long failing to rise to the level of the task for which it had been instituted, was doing valuable work in giving credit to peasants

short of land to enable them to take up new holdings; and in this movement also Shidlovsky, as a member of the Board of the Bank (1899-1905), took part. In 1905 he was appointed to be Director of the Department of Agriculture, and was one of those Liberal administrators who were trained in the school of the sympathetic and progressive Minister of Agriculture A. S. Ermolov. After the failure of the first two Dumas, Shidlovsky was elected to the Third Duma in 1907. This was the Octobrist Duma, and much of the salt of it was to be found in the small group of Left Octobrists of whom Shidlovsky was one. From this group were taken one President of the Duma, N. A. Khomyakov, and two Vice-Presidents, Baron A. F. Meyendorff and Shidlovsky himself (1910). In 1909, with the President and other leading members of the Duma taken from all the various central parties, Shidlovsky visited England. Speaking the English of an English country gentleman, he made several notable speeches during this visit, particularly at a dinner given by the Chamber of Commerce in Liverpool. He was also one of those who contributed most to the remarkable unanimity of so many representatives of various Russian parties. In the Duma, Shidlovsky's most distinguished work was the revision of Stolypin's legislation on land settlement, than which no more important task ever fell to the Duma. It was in the main due to Shidlovsky that a reform of the first importance, originally only crudely shaped and carried into execution by an abuse of the Constitution, came out of the Duma as a considered programme of land settlement and as the first constructive achievement of co-operation between the Government and the Duma. The effects of this Act, which encouraged and facilitated individual peasant land ownership, were among the most striking features in the economic progress which Russia was then making.

In 1915, when nearly all the more enlightened members of the Duma formed into a Liberal and patriotic association under the name of the Progressive *bloc*, Shidlovsky was chosen as its leader. He also took an energetic part in the Special Conference for munitioning the Russian army. When the autocracy fell in February 1917, Shidlovsky was one of the standing committee of government, which evolved from itself the new ministry. He was offered the Ministry of Agriculture, but preferred to leave it to his fellow-worker on the Voronezh zemstvo, Dr. Shingarev, who had equally devoted his life to the cause of the peasants. Shidlovsky was also a member of the Fore-Parliament, which formed the last buttress of the Provisional

Government before it was overthrown by the Bolsheviks. For nearly three years, till the summer of 1920, he lived in great privation under the Soviet Government, but ultimately was able to make his way out to Reval. Here he engaged in teaching work and contributed several articles to the local Russian newspaper "Poslednia Izvestia." His thoughts and conversation were full of Russia, and he was always calling for steady spade-work for its recovery, which he earnestly hoped to live to see. But his health had been completely shattered by the privations which he had suffered under the Soviet *régime*, and after heart trouble, resulting in two serious strokes, he died at Reval among his wife and children on July 6, 1922. There was no cleaner man in Russian political life. Honour to a lifelong friend of England and a devoted servant of the Russian people !

B. P.

CHRONICLE NOTES.

I.—RUSSIA.

The New Phase of Bolshevism.

DURING the past summer the curious change that marks a transition into a new phase has become pronounced in Russia. It is not so much that Bolshevism, or the Bolsheviks, are changing, as that Russia herself is moving, is slowly struggling towards recovery. Green shoots of a new life are beginning to break through the parched and ravaged soil.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party still rules Russia. Outwardly, the extent of their rule is even wider than before. In October the Japanese evacuated Vladivostok; the local anti-Bolshevik Government, that administered the region under Japanese protection, collapsed at once, and the troops of the Far Eastern or Chita Republic assumed control. Thus the rule of the Bolsheviks now extends to the Pacific coast, and no foreign troops and no large organised anti-Bolshevik forces remain on Russian soil. There are continual disturbances in the Caucasus, which are put down with a heavy hand. The insurrectionary movement of Moslems in Fergana in Turkestan, at one moment early in the year, seemed to be at the point of securing victory in Bokhara. Enver Pasha, the former Turkish Commander-in-Chief, established a somewhat ambiguous connection with this movement, and a large number of recruits came over from Northern Afghanistan. By a great effort the Bolsheviks defeated the insurgents in the early autumn. It is not known whether the movement is finally crushed or whether the leaders are still holding out with some part of their forces in the mountains of Fergana. At any rate, the Bolsheviks have had to make considerable concessions to the demands of the local population, and to abandon the attempt to maintain anything like a Communist régime. In the other regions, where insurrection seemed to have become a habit, in the Ukraine and in Siberia, the disturbance has died down, though in the Ukraine cases of brigandage are still frequent. From time to time reports are published of the discovery of plots for the overthrow of the Soviet Government. Thus in October a large number of pupils of training schools for Red Officers in Petrograd were arrested on a charge of being implicated, with a number of senior officers, in such a conspiracy. It is also reported that the State Political Department has discovered in Petrovsk, on the Caspian, a sailors' organisation that was engaged in preparations for a rising. There is discontent in the Red Army, discontent among

the students, among Soviet officials of all grades, among peasants and workmen. In Petrograd labour troubles are frequent. The miners of the Donets Basin went out on strike early in November, as a protest against low wages and restrictive regulations. Everywhere there is a strange, weary discontent, a brooding, debilitating and corroding atmosphere. No one is happy in Russia except those who find in dire affliction innumerable occasions for active sympathy, new bonds of comradeship in the struggle to defend life against the incessant pressure of moral and physical destruction. There is a zest in suffering that appeals strongly to the Russian mind, and the best of Russians, suddenly thrust into exile and the comparative ease and comfort of Western lands, often long to return to Russia, even under a *régime* they loathe, in order that they may share again in the heartbreaking and fascinating experience of the suffering of Russia, in which they perceive a spiritual revelation.

The Collapse of the Communist Experiment.

There is quiet heroism amid the chaos and the true spirit of martyrdom. That heaven must tell. It enters deeply into those curious and varied forms of passive resistance by which Russia is steadily undermining Bolshevism. But for the present the Communist Party holds power. It almost seems as though the nation, after spasmodic and chaotic efforts to overthrow the visible forms of their power, were now waiting till the Communists exhaust themselves in a fruitless and impossible task, and were sapping their power in all kinds of new ways from within. The Communists are still in the Kremlin and ostentatiously parade their authority. But they are not the same Communists. It is not that they are better or worse than they were, or even wiser or more foolish. The medium in which they work is changing. They are not evolving, but Russia is evolving, and they are engaged in a strenuous effort to maintain their balance and to retain control in the steadily increasing pace of Russian evolution. Their present system is not Communism, and does not even pretend to be Communism. All it even professes to be is a method of maintaining a certain group in power and of preserving their hold over Russian resources, in order that they may pursue a policy which they describe as fostering the world-revolution. The so-called "New Economic Policy" is, in practice, a primitive and hybrid form of capitalism, set about with all manner of hastily improvised checks and contrivances, designed to prevent the beginnings of economic freedom from expanding into political freedom. It is an expedient for giving the Russian peoples barely room enough to live, and to prevent the appalling disaster into which the application of State coercion to every detail of economic life was plunging the whole country, all classes, and even the Soviet Government itself. At the same time, it is not intended to permit room enough for the Russian people to live their own life, to choose their own way, to escape from

the control of the Communist Party or from the necessity of subserving its international designs. Lenin said recently, at the Congress of the Communist International, that the new economic policy had saved the Revolution. Perhaps he meant that it had enabled the Communist Party to continue their work of world-revolution, or simply that it has kept in power in Russia a group that still professes Communist aims, though it has abandoned Communist practice. In Russia, at any rate, no revolution has been saved; Revolution in the Bolshevik sense has there been defeated.

Theory and Practice.

The growing contrast between the theory and purpose of the Bolsheviks and the facts of Russian life is the only clue that can be securely grasped in the map of present Russia conditions. The noise of the Bolshevik jargon fills the world. Most of that jargon has now lost whatever significance it may once have had in Russia. Many hundreds of Soviet decrees are now waste-paper; thousands of plans and schemes have been cast on the rubbish-heap. The new laws that are coming out are slipping back little by little into the framework of older habits and older days. Land laws have been issued that in many points bear a strong resemblance to Stolypin's agrarian reform. The new rules of judicial procedure are in very many respects a clumsy adaptation of the excellent judicial system that prevailed under the Imperial *régime*, with curious Bolshevik interpolations and with precise reservations in favour of tyranny—as though some new Plehve had amended the judicial system in the interests of some extreme and crude reaction. These and many other concessions, these so-called reforms, are a testimony to the steady encroachment of life on the whole system of Bolshevik tyranny.

Normal life is in fact steadily recovering initiative. Shops are open in the towns. Buying and selling go on continually—in a fantastic currency in which a million is one of the lowest units; cafés and restaurants do a regular business; houses long neglected and allowed to sink into appalling disrepair are being renovated in Petrograd and Moscow. People in the streets are beginning to look better clothed and better fed. Domestic servants are again becoming a regular and openly recognised institution, and in addressing their employers they use the old Russian equivalents for "Sir" and "Madam." Government institutions are becoming eminently respectable in their customs. The word "comrade" is quickly dropping out of use as a form of address. Trains are running now with regularity on the main lines and their condition is much improved, mainly because the Soviet administration have left the management of the railways very much in the hands of the regular railway staff. With all this, strangely enough, the pay of the railway employees, like the pay of the majority of government officials, is heavily in arrears.

New Business Methods.

An extraordinary new world of business is gradually emerging, in which strangers have great difficulty in finding their way. It is a strange combination of bold individual initiative and Government connivance or open participation. The so called "Trusts," combinations of business men, engineers and Soviet departments, which run the nationalised industries—on the understanding that with the help of Government subsidies they run the enterprises on commercial lines, arranging for their own raw material and markets—are a source of quick profits to those who participate, though their effect in stimulating production has been minute and they represent a very heavy loss to the State. A Commission recently appointed to enquire into the state of the metal industry has reported that the Trust system as applied there is a complete failure, and the industry is almost at a standstill. The resources of the State Bank have been depleted in the effort to maintain the trusts. Emissaries are being sent abroad to invite former owners of factories to come back and take charge of their old businesses, on condition of sharing their profits with the Bolshevik Government. One of these emissaries explained to a group of refugee manufacturers in Berlin that factories had to be kept going to a certain extent because, if they were definitely closed down, the workmen would ruin them completely by walking off with parts of the machinery. The "trust" phase of nationalised industry has stimulated for a time the circulation of money and goods; it has made a certain number of alert people rich; it has given an exceptional opportunity to speculators, official and unofficial, to turn to their profit nationalised goods from Soviet stores and large supplies of Soviet currency. Only in rare cases has it increased production, and since its financial basis is thoroughly unsound, it seems to be fast going the way of other Soviet experiments. It represents an attempt of the Bolsheviks to divest themselves of part of the intolerable burden they had assumed in attempting to run every branch of the economic life of Russia as a government department. The attempt was half-hearted, because, while delegating responsibility, they tried to retain the control and a share of the profits.

The change that is gradually coming about affects the administration. First of all, in this new world of business that has forced its way into daylight there is an intricate community of interest between officials and non-officials, partly because business is not yet fully denationalised and is still hampered at every turn by State interference, and partly because officials directly engage in business and share the profits, many of them making great profit out of their connivance in the constant evasion of all sorts of restrictive rules and laws. The speculator, the profiteer and the corrupt official work hand in hand, and it is often difficult to distinguish one from the other. All seek to use the present opportunity to secure personal gain from property, goods and money that for the moment are no man's property,

since they are but loosely nationalised, their former owners cannot make good their claim, and Soviet subsidies are still available in a currency which, though terribly depreciated, can yet be transformed, with an effort, into real currency and real values.

There is the further fact that in the Soviet institutions the so-called 'specialists'—often old officials or trained engineers and business men—are gaining more and more influence. The Communists in the administration are becoming isolated; there are very few real Communists left. Some are absorbed in routine work, others are hastening to get rich, and others are acting as the "eyes" of the Central Committee of the Party or of the State Political Department (the former *Chrezvychayka*).

The Soviets and Popular Representation.

Thirdly, there is the fact that outside the big centres the Soviets are largely autonomous, only carrying out directions from the centre in order to avoid excessive interference and unpleasant penalties. In the summer a large number of Soviets in the Ural developed democratic tendencies and tried to introduce democratic reforms—*i.e.*, free popular representation, under the ægis of Bolshevism. The leaders were summoned to Moscow and sharply called to order, and the movement died down. In the recent elections to the Soviets "non-party" majorities were secured against the Communists in many districts, particularly in the south. In key positions, where the Bolsheviks considered it necessary to maintain a firm hold, they quashed the elections and secured the return of a Communist majority by their own peculiar methods. This does not alter the fact that the administration throughout the country is becoming gradually and steadily non-party. The Bolsheviks know this, and the knowledge disturbs them. The tendency of administrative and economic practice is pulling more and more against them.

Yet the Bolsheviks rule. Their ranks are thinning, and even in the minds of their immediate followers conviction is crumbling. A very prominent member of the party, occupying a high office, declared last winter that he was sick to death of hearing about Communism. The members of the ruling group are divided in their views on theory and tactics. Some are supposed to be extreme; others are called moderates. They hold together because they must. They have no choice. They must stand or fall together. It is interesting that of late there have been no serious disputes among the leaders about policy—except in one matter. No real attempt has been made to reverse the new economic policy and to return to Communism. They dare not go back, and it is quite possible that they dare not go forward. They fear to extend economic freedom, even though it is becoming clearer daily that the partial freedom already granted can only postpone, but cannot prevent, collapse. The extension of economic freedom means the gradual and inevitable return of political freedom, and for the Bolsheviks that is fatal.

The Terror in its later Phase.

The efforts of the ruling group are, therefore, now aimed in two directions. First of all, they are trying to strengthen their despotism by systematically counteracting the political efforts of the new economic policy. One result of the changes of the last year has been that people have begun to breathe more freely. A common description of the new spirit is that "fear has gone." The terror, whether applied violently or more mildly, no longer seems so terrible. It has lost much of its power of intimidation. People have begun to speak their minds, to be less cautious in their utterances. In the eyes of the Bolsheviks this constitutes a political danger, and therefore they have again intensified their repressive measures. They hold their power by having their trained and disciplined agents in every part of the country, in every branch of the administration, in every unit of the army, prepared to act ruthlessly at any sign of insubordination. The State Political Department, as the Che-Ka or Extraordinary Commission is now named, has its spies—suborned or bound by intimidation or by the holding of relatives as hostages—in every corner of the social structure. The powers of the State Political Department, restricted for a time, have recently been extended so as to permit its agents to arrest or execute at discretion. A new war has been proclaimed by Trotsky—a war on "the ideological front," a war against that stubborn mentality which, even after all these years of horrible suffering, still refuses to accept Soviet tenets, to surrender in spirit to the Bolsheviks.

The Campaign against the Church.

Most conspicuously this campaign has been waged against the Church. The details of that cruel campaign are well known now. Hundreds of faithful priests have been shot. The Patriarch has been arrested and is to be tried in November. The Metropolitan Benjamin of Petrograd has been shot, and to fierce intimidation has been added a subtle and poisonous propaganda intended to divide, disorganise and demoralise the community of Orthodox believers. A certain number of bishops, priests and laymen have lent themselves to this Bolshevik design, and with their help a Soviet Church Department has been set up to promote a movement described as "the living Church." This movement has already split up into two sections, the leaders having quarrelled on the question of the extent to which subservience to the Bolsheviks was permissible. The enterprise enjoys no popular sympathy, and is, in fact, already discredited, but a very severe blow has been given to the organisation of the Orthodox Church. But the Bolsheviks have not achieved their aim. Persecution has strengthened the religious spirit they so greatly fear.

The Expulsion of Intellectuals.

After the Church, the Bolsheviks turned their attention to the intellectuals. They suddenly arrested a number of professors and writers in Moscow, Petrograd, and other towns, and in October

banished them. A certain number exiled abroad have arrived in Germany, and others are expected. Some have been banished to Archangel. The new exiles are not charged with any particular political activities. They were simply chosen as prominent representatives of a habit of thought, definitely and irreconcilably hostile to the Bolshevik scheme of life. Some of those exiled, or about to be exiled, are philosophers like Berdiayev, Lossky, Frank and Karsavin; others are economists and journalists like Madame Kuskova, Prokopovich, Izgoiev, Osorgin, Makotin, Peshekhonov and Sorokin. The leading Russian poetess, Anna Akhmatova, is reported to have been exiled, but her whereabouts are uncertain. In a word, the Bolsheviks are redoubling their efforts to rid the country of its intellectual leaders, to stamp out the mentality that prevents them from moulding the Russian people according to their will. At the same time they are renewing their propaganda with energy and are trying to drill their ideas into the younger generation.

It is curious, with all this, that the Soviet papers during the last few months have contained articles exposing the complete failure of the Bolshevik schemes of educational reform. It is roundly declared in these articles that, under Bolshevism, the percentage of illiteracy has greatly increased, and that under the old *régime* far more was actually done for popular education. Lunacharsky, the Commissary for Education, has taken part in this exposure, while, on the other hand, he himself is blamed by critics for lavishing money and care on abstruse forms of art in the capitals and neglecting the education of the masses. A report of his resignation has recently been current.

Intensified persecution combined with propaganda is, then, one of the methods by which the ruling Bolshevik group are trying to ward off the dangers that threaten them.

Moscow's Attitude to Foreign Capital.

The other method is the pursuit of a curious policy of so adjusting their relations with the outside world as to secure the foreign capital that Russia so sorely needs, without admitting the political and economic consequences which the introduction of foreign capital must entail. All the manœuvring at Genoa and the Hague finally brought the Soviet Government up against this elementary fact, that foreign credit could not be granted unless the Bolsheviks recognised Russia's foreign debts and compensated the foreign owners of property confiscated in Russia for the losses they had incurred. To these conditions the Soviet Government has not yet submitted.

Since the Hague Conference there have been continual negotiations between the Bolsheviks and capitalists of various countries regarding possible concessions in Russia. In nearly every case these negotiations have broken down. The Germans, who seemed to have secured a privileged position by the Treaty they concluded with the Bolsheviks

at Rapallo during the Genoa Conference, have made great efforts to do business in Bolshevist Russia, and though German firms are carrying out certain small contracts and though German technical experts have secured important positions in Russian works, it has been impossible even for the Germans to do serious business on an extensive scale in present conditions.

Mr. Leslie Urquhart, of the Russian Consolidated, Ltd., concluded with Krassin in Berlin what seemed to be a comparatively favourable agreement providing for a concession on the properties of the Company in the Urals and Siberia for ninety-nine years and for compensation for the loss caused by nationalisation. This agreement the Soviet Government refused to ratify, nominally because British policy was hostile to Russia on the Turkish question; really, because the ratification of the concession would have meant advancing another stage on the road to ordinary capitalism. From this the more stubborn Bolshevik leaders shrink, in spite of their great economic and financial need. They fear that the return of capitalism will mean the end of their political power. There is still, they think, a gambler's chance in continuing the attempt to play off one capitalist nation against another.

Lately there has been a sudden and surprising renewal of intercourse between France and Russia. M. Herriot, the Radical leader, paid a visit to Moscow and his visit led to a campaign in the French press in favour of promoting French commercial enterprise under Bolshevik auspices. The campaign was largely political in character and had no serious business backing. Of far greater significance is the agreement concluded in October between the representatives of all the big British, American, French and Dutch oil interests together with the former Russian owners of oilfields in Russia, whereby they bound themselves not to seek any advantage in Russia at each other's expense and to conduct all negotiations with the Soviet Government jointly. A similar agreement was afterwards concluded between the French, Belgian and Russian owners of mining and metallurgical properties in South Russia.

For the Bolsheviks the choice remains—either to yield to the steady pressure of foreign capital, that will work in its own way or none, or to risk economic collapse in Russia and stake all their chances on the speedy renewal of disturbances in Europe and the extension of revolution. They look in both directions. Their propaganda is active both in European countries and in the East. They are working intensively in Germany, hoping to take full advantage of the increasing economic troubles there. They have by no means neglected Ireland, and their emissaries are at work in England. They are playing an active part, through their allies, the Turks, in fomenting the near Eastern crisis and are calculating on the possibilities of new wars and revolutions in the Balkans. Roumania and Poland are closely watching the activities of Moscow.

Lenin's health is partly restored and he has resumed political work. His speech at the Congress of the Third International held in Moscow in November shows, however, a very considerable decline of mental power.

B.—POLAND.

[The following survey of the Polish political situation has been supplied to us by a valued Polish correspondent, whose views we do not necessarily endorse on every point.—ED.]

Recent Political Events in Poland.

Three outstanding facts dominated public attention in Poland all through the summer—which is usually a dead season—and in the early months of autumn.

The first and most sensational of these was a Cabinet crisis, which burst over the country quite unexpectedly. It was anticipated on all sides that the colourless, non-party, compromise Cabinet of Professor Ponikowski would carry on the government of the country until the Constituent Assembly had terminated its work, the first Polish Parliament under the new Constitution had been elected, and a strictly party Government could be formed. Ponikowski's Cabinet had been in power for a period unusually long in a country which had not yet been able to settle down to anything like normal political conditions. The Cabinet included the energetic reformer of Polish finance, Dr. Michalski, who had swung something like a "Geddes Axe" over much bureaucratic waste in the government services, reduced their *personnel* considerably, withdrawn 80 milliards of paper money from circulation by the drastic means of a "Capital Levy," and finally submitted to the Constituent Assembly, in spring 1922, the first really businesslike and orderly Budget of the Polish State. If his efforts had been of no avail to stop the catastrophic fall of the Polish mark in the money market, the necessity for new issues of paper money, and the increase of deficit and debt, this was admittedly due to international rather than domestic reasons.

Ponikowski's Cabinet had also included, in the office of Foreign Minister, the well-known figure of Mr. Skirmunt, whose balanced attitude and skilful diplomacy had won for him at Genoa a position like that of Mr. Dmowski at the Versailles Conference.

The Cabinet crisis originated in a sudden demand for high armament credits, put forward by the Chief of State, Marshal Piłsudski, at a Cabinet Council. The details of the affair have never become fully known to the general public, but it must be assumed that Piłsudski had what seemed to him fully reliable information that Soviet Russia was about to attack Poland after the harvest, to feed her hungry millions with Polish corn, and that he wanted to form a really strong Government of National Defence in order to meet the situation.

It is needless to enter into the painful story of a harassing

interregnum which lasted for two months and inflicted very palpable material losses on the country. Controversy was waged furiously, the crisis widened into a conflict between the Chief of State and the Constituent Assembly, and looked as if it were going to extend to the very position of the Chief of State himself. The interpretation both of the Minor (or Provisional) Constitution of 1919, and of the Major (or Definitive) one of March 17, 1921, as to the proceedings in cases of Cabinet crises, was disputed long and fiercely. A Premier appointed by Piłsudski (Artur Sliwinski) was defeated in the Chamber, one nominated by a majority of the Assembly (Korfanty, the hero of Upper Silesia) failed to secure Piłsudski's sanction. Ultimately, a non-party compromise Cabinet, much like Ponikowski's, was formed under the presidency of Professor Nowak of Cracow University; in fact it contains a number of Ministers of the former Cabinet in the same positions. The Foreign Office, however, has been entrusted to Mr. Narutowicz, formerly Minister of Public Works; while Mr. Skirmunt is to occupy the important position of Polish diplomatic representative in London, where his appearance will undoubtedly be received with satisfaction. Finance is in the hands of Mr. Jastrzebski, an experienced banker from Shanghai, who has already begun his activity by making a statement to the Assembly of various projected measures of financial reform. Chief among these is the creation of a type of Government security which will make investment possible to the small man in spite of the fluctuations of Polish currency. To the disappointment of many, however, the new Minister has not been able to produce any radical *panacea* for the financial evil, and in fact has not shrunk from declaring that he does not see his way to introduce any further drastic economies into the Budget. It is more clear than ever that Poland must wait for a European solution of the world's financial difficulties to enable her to put her house in order.

The Polish Constituent.

At the present moment, the crisis is forgotten, as past history, in the excitement of the General Election, which is to replace the Constituent Assembly, in November, by the first regular two-chamber Polish Parliament, composed of an elective Senate and a Chamber of Deputies.

The Constituent Assembly, ending its work after four strenuous years, was naturally subjected to much trenchant criticism in its political obituaries. The idea was ridiculed that history should ever draw a parallel between it and the Great Four Years' Diet which sat during the last years of the old Polish State and redeemed it from the reproach of going down in the rottenness of unreformed abuses, by producing the Constitution of the Third of May, 1791, on the very eve of perdition.

The Constituent Assembly of the New Poland had all the qualities of a modern democratic parliamentary body, and the defects of these qualities. Chief among them is hasty and ill-considered legislation

to meet the needs of a feverish time, impatient of delay, and the imperious demands of a clamouring electorate. The Constitution framed by the Assembly has many a serious fault in its 126 articles, as was judiciously pointed out by the first authorities in political law in Poland on the occasion of the anniversary of its proclamation. And the pressure of a powerful peasantry, who are the vast majority of the electoral body, made it necessary that a sweeping Land Reform Bill should be among the Assembly's first measures in 1919. This provided for a rapid break-up of all large estates in favour of medium-sized peasant farms, to be established with State assistance. The natural dissolution of large estates, a process which had begun long ago and was very much accelerated by the war, was thus to be precipitated. Both the strain on the State's credit and the inevitable decrease of agricultural production in case of rapid transition to such a thoroughly changed system, would have constituted grave dangers to the national wealth of Poland, if forces had not been at work all along to check the execution of the provisions of the Bill. But a huge bureaucratic apparatus had to be created in ostensible satisfaction of the reformers' demands; and it is but one of the many bureaucratic burdens of a State exercising so many more social functions than average constitutional states did in the old days of Liberalism.

The Constituent Assembly had had to be elected on the very broadest basis of universal suffrage (including women), which everybody must admit to have been premature in the case of a country still cursed by the vast mass of illiteracy which the Russian Government had so carefully cultivated in its part of Poland during the XIXth century. But no other way lies open to a modern Republic, and the Electoral Law framed by the Assembly for the coming elections of Polish Parliaments could not be based on anything else than universal adult suffrage, free from any qualification either of property, education or sex. Vote by ballot is, of course, an equally necessary ingredient, and another outstanding feature is proportional representation on the Belgian *scrutin de liste* system. Both this and the manner in which the electoral districts have been delimited, are intended to prevent the splitting of the Polish Parliament into a large number of factions, and to conduce to the consolidation of a few large political parties.

The Polish Party System.

In the Constituent Assembly the force of facts had led to the formation of two coalitions from the large number of small political groups. The Bloc of the Right consisted chiefly of the National Democrats, who may be said to represent the landed, industrial, and commercial interests, and who certainly include, on the intellectual side, some of the best brains in the country. "Church and State" may be roughly defined as their old Tory tenets. They are strenuous Imperialists, as was manifested by their demand for the complete annexation both of Eastern Galicia and of the Vilna district, without

any particularly large provincial autonomy. The pivot of their foreign policy is the reality of the German danger. They are firm on the close alliance with France (which, in fact, everybody in Poland considers an unalterable political necessity) and more fierce than others in their antagonism to the Jews (whom, again, everybody in Poland admits to be the most difficult factor to deal with in the state). They are equally resolute for solidarity with the Little Entente, particularly with Czecho-Slovakia; here a strong body of popular feeling is undoubtedly against them. Finally, they have not forgotten the great Russian markets for Polish industry, which, as a matter of fact, there is little hope of ever regaining to their full extent.

Ever since the fall of the Government of Paderewski (who was their man) the National Democrats have been in opposition and, in particular, have conducted an unrelenting campaign against the head of the State, Piłsudski, who is their *bête noire* both on account of having come from the ranks of the National Socialists and of having led the Polish Legions in alliance with Austria and Germany at the beginning of the war. The parts of the country where National Democrats enjoy fullest and nearly unanimous support are the western provinces of Poznań and Silesia on the German border. This was recently made manifest by the Nationalist victory at the elections for the Silesian provincial diet. It is not in vain that it is to Poznań that the acknowledged and most capable leader of the National Democratic Party, Mr. Dmowski, has withdrawn, as to an Achilles' tent, for a period of grim political retirement. He is the only candidate whose name will occur to any Pole as a possible nominee for the Presidency of the Polish Republic in case the Parliamentary elections turn the balance in favour of the Right.

The Bloc of the Left, on the other hand, unanimously persist in idolising Piłsudski as the *unus qui nobis*—but by no means *cunctando restituit rem*. And it is undeniable that Piłsudski, however he may have chilled the fervour of his admirers by his autocratic and incalculable behaviour during the recent crisis, still stands before the eyes of the nation as a strong and great historical figure, being the man who by his determined military action made the Polish cause a living European issue of the world war, by organising latent resistance against the Germans prepared the way for self-deliverance, and by his arrival from a German prison in November, 1918, saved the beginnings of Polish state existence from utter chaos and disruption. He still embodies to the unprejudiced Polish observer the power of the nation's self-preserving instinct, as manifested in great historical decisions and actions at the most critical moments in Poland's modern life and struggle for life.

The Bloc of the Left, the attitude of which on this point has so far been certainly one of *Aut Cæsar aut nihil*, is slightly superior in numbers to the Right, but much more heterogeneous in composition. The strongest parliamentary party—the peasants—find themselves there in unnatural union with Socialists, as both these groups stand

for far-reaching reforms and democracy *sans phrase* in the political system. Naturally, the representatives of national minorities and, in particular, of the Jews, are with them against the Right, and are kept in sympathy with the Left by promises of protection.

Midway between the Blocs a small *bourgeois* party played an important part repeatedly during the recent crisis, holding the balance between the Blocs, and throwing in its weight by turns with the Right or the Left. A stronger body, the Nationalist Labour Party, also occupies somewhat of a middle position, although rather to the Left. The real question, in fact, in recent developments very often was whether a governing centre of chiefly Left or of chiefly Right parties was to be formed.

This, it is safe to predict, will be the main problem in the political situation after the new election, because a crushing defeat either of the Right or of the Left is hardly to be foreseen. Accordingly, efforts to create a really strong Centre Party are being made, in whose hands the fate of the Party System would practically lie. There is a "State Union" in the field, composed of *bourgeois* elements, intellectuals, and moderate Reformers, but it has not given sufficient proofs of its vitality yet, since it has appeared too late, just on the eve of the elections, and it is certainly a somewhat amphibious political entity.

It is supposed that the new election will result in larger representation of the national minorities of the border provinces. A statute of provincial autonomy was framed post-haste for Eastern Galicia, hurried through the Assembly before its end and communicated to the Powers in order to give legal ground for holding elections in that disputed territory with its old Polish towns (such as Lwów) and its undoubtedly Polish civilisation.

The Jews, being the strongest factor among the national minorities, took the initiative in organising a Bloc of these for electoral purposes. But the secession of the more radical Jewish elements has deprived it of some of the strength it might have had.

Communist propaganda, conducted at great expense by Soviet Russia, is rampant underground. It had a few (very clamorous) voices in the Assembly, and will perhaps have more in the new Parliament. But it is safe, again, to assert that a Communist Poland is an impossibility, barred as it is most completely by the most overwhelming political power in the country—the peasants, who certainly are impenetrably sound on private property and a capitalist system, however far they may wish to go in the redistribution of land and the social degradation of the intellectuals. The existence of a Left Wing of the Peasant Party, violently at war with the Right Wing, because representative of hired agricultural labour as against the peasant proprietors and the landowners, cannot affect this forecast essentially, in spite of such a glaring display of revolutionary spirit as the recent great rural strike in Poznań during the most critical weeks of harvest.

It is also safe to foretell that, whatever the party complexion of the

new Parliament and Government may become, the wishes of that most powerful social factor—the peasants—will have decisive weight in the consideration of every political issue, very much as the wishes of Labour have in England. Unfortunately, it must be added that the peasants, prosperous now as they have never been before, have also been hitherto, and are likely to be still in the near future, the chief obstacle to thoroughgoing financial reform in Poland, as their unwillingness to sacrifice part of their rapidly growing wealth to the State wrecks all attempts at really productive taxation.

Economic Recovery.

This brings us to the third outstanding fact in recent Polish life—an economic fact. The Eastern Fair, held this year for the second time in Lwów, was a magnificent display of Poland's rising welfare and increasing volume of trade and industry. It demonstrated *ad oculos* even more powerfully than the first fair in 1921 had done, that there is no relation whatever between the ridiculous international exchange rate of the Polish mark and the undoubted actual welfare of the country. Perhaps part of this discrepancy may be explained by the late Prime Minister Ponikowski's *obiter dictum* that "in Poland everybody fares well, only the State fares ill." The spirit of individual liberty, which was the glory and the ruin of the old Polish Commonwealth, has certainly produced much effort that is a glory to New Poland. It may be hoped that the authority of the State will grow sufficiently to avert the darker parallel.

Polish Foreign Policy.

For obvious reasons, little can here be said of the foreign relations of Poland during recent months. Again, three facts may be singled out from among the unceasing process of all sorts of treaties and conventions (chiefly commercial) which are continually being concluded with other states.

The first of these is the Marienbad Agreement, in which the Polish Minister in Prague, M. Piltz, was chiefly instrumental. It has certainly brought Poland visibly nearer to a constant working understanding with the Powers of the Little Entente. But it would be vain to deny that very essential divergences in political tendency exist. The attitude both of Czecho-Slovakia and even Jugoslavia on the Eastern Galician problem, sufficiently proves this on one side, and the imperfect sympathy of Polish national sentiment for the Czechs, as frequently manifested in the Press, on the other. It would be foolish, again, to overlook the fact that at the bottom of Polish-Czech differences there is more than a grievance about Western border territories and disagreement about important international problems. There is, in fact, "incompatibility of temper," as there must be between a nation that got its reckless idealism and chivalrous code of manners from its gentry, and another nation in which hard realism

and patient endurance, together with a certain tincture of roughness, spread from the peasant stock to all other classes.

The second fact which must be mentioned is the Chief of State's recent visit of ceremony to the Roumanian Court, and his Royal welcome there. The alliance with Roumania, dictated by common danger from the East, is a fundamental fact in Poland's position in Eastern European affairs, as is the alliance with France in its attitude towards Western problems.

This fact gives its proper character to another important event of recent weeks: the Baltic Conference on disarmament, in which Poland took part, together with the minor Baltic States and with Soviet Russia. The defeat of Esthonia's proposal for mutual guarantees against aggression by one of the parties—a defeat of course caused by Soviet Russia, against which the proposal was in fact aimed—is another lesson to Western Europe, very much like the refusal to ratify the Urquhart Agreement. Poland has now been in peaceful diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia for a longer time than any other European Power: but nobody in Poland, of whatever party he may be, is under any delusion as to security on this side. Continuous difficulties have to be patiently overcome by the Polish representation in the matter of restoration of Polish treasures of art and industrial property under the provisions of the Riga Peace; and the return of prisoners of war and exiles under the provisions of the same treaty was accomplished by Russia under conditions which are a lasting disgrace to humanity. So much for sanctity of treaties. And a more recent treaty—the Treaty of Rapallo—forgotten by Europe in the heat of the Kemalist crisis and the rearrangements it occasioned in the grouping of the Powers—is well remembered by the Poles. It is almost proverbial in Poland that Russo-German treaties were always written on Poland's skin.

The Polish Elections.

The results of the elections as officially announced in the main bear out the forecast given above. The figures are as follows:—

				Chamber of Deputies.	Senate.
Bloc of the Right	169	52
Bloc of the Left, including—					
1. Moderate Peasant Party	...	70	189		14
2. Agricultural Labour Party	...	49			9
3. Polish Socialist Party	...	41			7
4. Nationalist Labour Party	...	18			2
5. Other small groups	...	11			
Bloc of National Minorities...	...		83		21
Communists	...		2	Non-party	6
				444	111

The only group which can play the part of a Centre Party and occasionally hold the balance between Right and Left in the two Chambers is the Nationalist Labour Party, with 18 seats in the lower and 2 in the upper house. The attempts to form a strong Centre Party out of middle-class elements (*bourgeois* and *intelligentsia*) have completely failed.

[*For reasons of space, the Chronicle dealing with Czechoslovakia, Jugoslavia and Bulgaria has inevitably been held over till No. 3—ED.*]

REVIEWS.

Vospominania: Tsarstvovanie Nikolaya II. (Memoirs: Reign of Nicholas II.) By Count S. Y. Witte. (Berlin, "Slovo," 1922). 2 vols. 1082 pp.

WITTE'S memoirs have been published in three editions. The Russian, which is dealt with here, is to be preferred, both as being complete from the accession of Nicholas II. (the earlier part is, apparently, to follow later), and also as preserving the colouring of the author's own words. There is also an English version edited by Abraham Ermolinsky, published by Heinemann (New York, 1921), and a French edition by François Rousseau, translated from the English version and containing some useful appendices; but these are re-arranged abridgments.

Witte himself explains that the memoirs were written in two different drafts, one of which (the more plainspoken) could only be secure abroad, and Countess Witte in the preface supports this statement. No sooner was her husband dead, she says, but the papers in his house were seized, and even his villa in Biarritz was carefully searched by a member of the Russian Embassy in Paris; but the memoirs were safe in a bank in Bayonne. Indirect confirmation is obtained from several passages in the book, which show that it was almost a practice to investigate the papers of a deceased Minister without delay, and that in one case (Sipyagin's) these papers were arbitrarily retained.

The style of the memoirs is bad, sometimes thoroughly bad. The arrangement presents all kinds of irregularity, due more often than not to the way in which the author's feelings run away with him the moment one of his *bêtes noires* appears incidentally in his narrative. Witte does not himself claim accuracy for his record, nor could he under the conditions under which the memoirs were written. But, whereas details, and sometimes important details, are wrongly stated, there is a remarkable consistency in Witte's version of the same events: his account reappears each time with a

monotonous sameness, and the book is in many ways extraordinarily honest.

Witte's object in writing his memoirs was plainly to give a personal defence of himself. This supersedes everything else, and is reflected in the proportions of the book. His own journeys, movements and happenings receive unnecessary attention—for instance, the mysterious story of an abortive plot made against his life. Again, his own extreme personal antipathies result in wearying reiterations of sheer abuse, of which the actual expressions are repeated each time that the subject crops up again. One almost feels that the author is too much out of temper to be able to deceive, or even to wish to make the attempt; and these excursions only help to show up more clearly the man's picture of himself and of his surroundings.

Witte was in an almost unique position. He was inside a world of which outsiders knew practically nothing; that little world decided the destinies of the Russian Empire. It was peculiarly poverty-stricken in ideas, intellect, culture and ability; if one leaves out a certain instinct of the surroundings which produced an inferior kind of cunning, one might say that its inhabitants were much below the level of ordinary intelligence. Witte was unquestionably a statesman and, as such, in this world he was almost alone. This, especially in view of the scarcity of other records, attaches an exceptional value to all that he has to tell us. Witte is a clever and able man watching a set of fools while they demolish a mighty empire.

The atmosphere of the book is one removed from all ordinary life. Naturally, in an autocracy, or in a government which thinks it is one, no account at all need be taken of the public. Witte himself is amazing in his indifference to the public as a whole and to its various spokesmen, and in his ignorance of the various sections of opinion and what they stand for. In an autocracy, all hopes, aims and intrigues are, so to speak, addressed to the autocrat. He is the centre round which everything else gravitates. Witte himself professes, in the most clamorous way, his belief in autocracy as the best thing for Russia. According to him, the Russian Empire is simply a creation of the Russian Army. As a matter of fact, the record of wars in which Russia was successful in the field is a limited one; and it might have been expected that at least a Minister of Finance, and at least Witte, would have recognised that far the greatest part of the empire—Siberia—was added to Russia practically without fighting of any kind, and solely by the migration thither,—that is, by the vitality—of the Russian people, whose success met with complete inattention on the part of the Government, and was hampered by its laws until restriction became futile and ridiculous. Witte goes so far as to say that there is no Russia, only a Russian Empire.

In such a view the personality of the autocrat is all important. For Alexander III., whom Witte justly describes as an honest man

with limited gifts and intelligence but with an iron will, he has nothing but praise, which several times becomes fulsome and dithyrambic. He seizes on the radical disqualification of Nicholas II. as a man who has no will at all. Nicholas had the greatest delicacy of manner, to which Witte repeatedly pays tribute; he says that he has never met anyone better bred, and that he knows no one who was not quite fascinated with Nicholas at a first meeting; this, by the way, would be confirmed from many sides.

Nicholas's character and intelligence Witte describes as "below the average"; several of the Ministers secured appointment because, as in the case of Lobanov-Rostovsky and Muravyev, Nicholas was almost entirely ignorant of the *personnel* of his diplomatic service; or again, because, as in the case of Muravyev, Birilev and, it might be added, Maklakov, they could regale the imperial couple with third-rate jokes or with horseplay for their children. He repeatedly charges Nicholas with deceitfulness. Whereas his father, when faced with unpleasant advice, might break into a temper, but would not bear ill-will afterwards, the son would say nothing, or only something equivocal and ambiguous, and harboured resentment ever afterwards. Of this Witte gives several instances. The whole picture of his relations with Nicholas II. is entertaining. Witte himself rather clumsily plays down to his sovereign, at least as far as manner and method of approach are concerned. On the other hand, he is sometimes not only, as he himself says, sharp-mannered, but even rude and vulgar; and one is not surprised when he naïvely repeats that his dismissal was greeted by the Empress with an ejaculation of mingled antipathy and relief. In the Empress, Witte sees, with only too good reason, one of the chief causes of Russia's ruin; but on this subject he offers us little but spite, scandal and invective. Several instances are given in which Nicholas fears to say what he means to a Minister; even fears to communicate to him his dismissal, and leaves him to learn it from a subsequent message or even, as in the case of Sazonov, from the newspapers. Witte himself reads in this way decisions on vital points, from which he had tried to dissuade his sovereign. Equally curious is the procedure in the choice of Ministers, and equally entertaining are the scenes in which the Emperor asks: "Whom do you recommend?" and Witte hedges until he can find an opening for mentioning the candidate whom he has in mind. To these criticisms of Nicholas II. others have added that of complete ingratitude for service done, and Witte, without formulating this charge, suggests it on different occasions.

The whole atmosphere of the government is one of constant intrigue. Witte gives a character sketch of each new Minister and his story of the appointment. Time after time we meet such expressions as "utterly incompetent," "quite unable to draw up a report," "as fit to be Commander-in-Chief as I am." In a few cases—for instance, those of Baron Freedericks and Prince Svyatopolk Mirsky—

Witte gives a certificate of complete disinterestedness and honesty, even of knightliness, but he regards the person in question as quite unqualified for his post. Pobedonostsev he describes as a man of brilliant mind but an intellectual nihilist. For others, such as Kokovtsev, and still more, his two principal *bêtes noires*, Plehve and Stolypin, he has nothing but spite at every reference. In the case of Stolypin, he has used up all his expletives before he reaches the point at which Stolypin appears on the political scene, and has nothing else left but to repeat them again almost verbatim. The background of all these intrigues is filled in with the secret police, who work in the dark on the most dubious authority, copying the worst methods of the revolutionaries, at points almost indistinguishable from them, and employed by one Minister to watch or search another. One recalls the incident of the Azev story, when a high official explained in the Russian press that a Minister selected as the next revolutionary victim might "reinsure" by turning their attention to one of his colleagues.

In this atmosphere Witte intrigues, by his own account, like the rest of them, only with more intelligence, daring and, at times, unscrupulousness. He joins hand, at need, with any enemy, and at one time works through the Dowager Empress. He sends his rival for the post of Minister of Finance, Kokovtsev, to Paris on an errand which, he is sure, will be unsuccessful. In his negotiations with Li Hung Chang he goes behind the back of the Foreign Minister and uses his own department to force a *fait accompli*. When he despairs of stopping the Far East adventure, he hurries off to the German Embassy and telegraphs, off his own bat, to the Kaiser, which, as foreign dispatches are generally deciphered, without delay becomes known to the Foreign Minister and to the Emperor. No wonder that, if he objected to his colleagues, many of his colleagues also objected to him. Perhaps his relations with Germany are the most surprising novelty in his many disclosures. When out of office and entrusted only with negotiating the Peace of Portsmouth, after the conclusion of this task, Witte, on his return journey, deals with the European situation in France, discards a suggestion of visiting England and, though apparently summoned home with urgency, stays with the Kaiser at Rominten, and confers with him in detail on issues of foreign policy. What he tells us makes less surprising the report, made on credible evidence, that Witte shortly before his death and during the Great War was seen in Germany.

Witte's account of himself is marred throughout the book both by his passion and by his vulgarity. The latter is at times stupendous; for instance, his narrative of his doings in America, of the deference paid him, of the traffic stopped in the streets to do him honour, is a very orgy of snobbery. There are long passages, easily detachable from his accounts of events, and intruded only to show that Witte did nearly everything good that got done.

These obscure such detail as he gives with regard to his own achievements. His railway administration—the first Ministry which he held was that of Communications—was unquestionably very able, and is only illustrated by side allusions. What he writes about the gold standard, the liquor monopoly, the tariff war with Germany, and his policy of foreign loans for industry, aims chiefly at showing that he had to carry these objects past almost universal opposition, which is true; but his short chapter on the accounts of the gold standard and the gold reserve are useful lessons in finance. He is very illuminating on the psychology of the ruling classes as to foreign loans, and what he writes makes quite intelligible the latter-day corruption of the Court. On the cry of Russia for the Russians, concessions to foreign industrialists are in principle discouraged, but in reality directed through the channel of those various adventurers who, by connections, impudence or obsequiousness, get known within the narrow circle of a Court entirely cut off from its nation. Such persons, on receiving the concession as trustworthy Russians, promptly make it over to the foreigner. Of the Transiberian Railway very little is said; but the Eastern Chinese Railway, from its political side, is dealt with in detail, and whatever may be said of this policy, it was at least on Witte's side clear, temperate and far-seeing, and carried out with unusual ability.

The interesting episode of the Agricultural Committees, though it takes up a good deal of space, gets lost in the passion of Witte's controversy with Plehve. Witte does not, for instance, think it necessary to give any further explanation of the equivocal memorandum to the Emperor which he wrote in this connection on the relations between autocracy and the *zemstva*, a document which left Witte practically free, after saying a good many incisive things, to give them either of the two most opposite interpretations.

The story of the Far East adventure is told in a good deal of detail, and though the scandalous side of this story predominates, the main course of Witte's struggle to prevent the Japanese War can be traced clearly throughout. It was an issue on which he was unquestionably right and showed great moral courage and persistence. In fact, if one can dismiss the personal side, there is left an excellent statement of the whole matter. Equally, there can be no doubt of the outstanding ability which Witte showed in negotiating the Treaty of Portsmouth, but he tells us hardly anything about the main points at issue and the way in which he dealt with them; and here his account is little more than what he might say to a journalist directly afterwards with the simple object, very ill achieved, of glorifying himself. The story of Nicholas's entirely haphazard agreement with the Kaiser at Björkö, by which he to all intents and purposes betrayed the French alliance, is one of the thrilling episodes in the book; and here again there can be no question that Witte rendered first-class service, not only to his

country, but to Europe. However, the episode only helps to bring out more clearly his consistent programme of a continental alliance, *i.e.*, of Russia, France and Germany, definitely not directed against America and having no meaning if it did not aim at the isolation of England.

Witte goes into very great detail on the internal crisis of October 1905. His memorandum to the Emperor before the October manifesto, which is inserted in full, is a document of first-class historical importance; but here, as in the earlier memorandum on autocracy and the *zemstva*, Witte is hedging at point after point. Even with all the frankness of his Memoirs, it still remains very difficult to say what were his exact views on constitutionalism for Russia, or whether he had any precise view and was not merely opportunist throughout. The writer of this review had the opportunity of putting this question to Witte himself, and the answer which he gave, certainly definite enough, was yet only the crystallisation of the disingenuousness on this subject which pervades the Memoirs. Witte, in reply to questions, declared himself to be the actual author of the October manifesto (which the Memoirs show to be only partially correct) and also of the accompanying communication of the Government of the same date (which the book confirms). But when asked what he thought of a constitution (the interview took place under Stolypin), he replied: "I have a constitution in my head, but as to my heart . . ." and he hereupon spat upon the floor of his study. On this subject the views expressed in the Memoirs absolutely box the compass, and we are left about as wise as at the start; it should, however, be mentioned that Witte's bile is not so much for the constitution as for the vast majority of the educated public which was then asking for it, and in particular for its various spokesmen. The trouble, as one knows, was that none of these would trust Witte. One would have expected more in the book on the subject of pogroms during Witte's premiership. These were largely aimed against himself. They were practically a strike of the reactionary police against the new order. There is, however, no subject on which Witte is more frank and convincing than on the Jewish question.

The next critical achievement of Witte; the enormous enlargement of the franchise on 24 December 1905, Witte passes over without mention; and no wonder—for it is the main cause of complaint against him and, as we see from an allusion later, was one of the principal causes of his fall. Witte is writing before the Revolution, and, had it already taken place, one may judge from the whole purpose and direction of the rest of the book that we should have had a full account of this all-important measure and that Witte would have taken to himself the greatest credit for it. In substance, this simple extension of the franchise which, with some reservations, went very much farther than the franchise then existing in England, was not altogether unreasonably taken as a ground for accusing

Witte almost of being in sympathy with the revolutionaries. It is interesting that this concession was drawn from him by an abortive rising by some workmen and a few students in Moscow, which proved to be a flash in the pan and more than anything else initiated a mood of reaction in the country as a whole. In a word, Witte, in his jump towards constitutionalism, failed to follow the cat.

Witte claims credit for not having interfered with the elections to the First Duma, and this credit should, generally, be allowed to him. In the rural districts, which were predominant, these were the only free elections, and the peasants did really in most cases send to St. Petersburg not party men, but those whom they considered the soundest spokesmen of their needs. Much space is given to the fundamental laws of 1906, and this is one of the most important parts of the book. These laws stabilised the reaction and, writing at a time when reaction was still enthroned, Witte practically claims the whole credit for the drafting of them. He passes naïvely, though evidently not without attention, over the evident disingenuity of emasculating the concessions of the October manifesto and settling the main questions of the new order of state in the interval before the Duma could meet. We are reminded of his earlier confession with regard to Russia's iniquitous seizure of Port Arthur. He himself tells us that, though he had strongly opposed this measure, he even officiously volunteered his assistance for carrying it out by making a heavy bribe to Li Hung Chang, which, as he uninterestedly explains, was followed by that statesman's political ruin.

The story of the great loan after his dismissal from the premiership is also told in detail. It is full of self-praise; and, while paying full tribute to his remarkable adroitness, one almost pities the dismissed Premier in his desperate effort to do something to please his Sovereign. It is he himself who points out the advantage gained to the Government by thus liquidating for the time the financial side of the Japanese War without the need of undergoing the criticism which the Duma would inevitably have made—both of the conduct of the war and of the whole Far Eastern adventure.

The interesting account of the demobilisation of the defeated army in Siberia is a valuable contribution to the history of the period and reflects some credit on Witte. What he tells us of his part in the punitive expeditions is certainly inconsistent with his boasts in other passages of his abstention from measures of repression.

Lastly, Witte helps to illuminate the complicated question of the crisis of Stolypin's government in 1911 associated with the establishment of *zemstva* in the western provinces of Russia. One learns from himself what part he took in the opposition to Stolypin.

The actual views of the author on important questions, when one gets to them past all his boasts and antipathies, are sound, wise and informing, and it is a great pity that they should be lost as they are in such a mass of prejudice, spite and scandal as the book

presents. As has been said, Witte believes that the right government for Russia is autocracy under a strong, even though limited, intelligence. For the autocracy, will is the first requisite. Administration should in all matters be informed and intelligent, and legislation be regulated and directed only through the recognised channels. Witte brings out the departure of the autocracy from legality by evading legislation through the Council of State, switching it off into the Committee of Ministers, and issuing its decisions as temporary ordinances; though, in his account of the gold standard, he shows that he is himself glad enough to make use of this course where he finds that the Council of State is against him. In the same way he stands, in general, for official and responsible administrators against chance influences and casual adventurers, though again his own methods are anything but a model of regularity. Reform he sees to be inevitable and wishes that it should be in the main directed from above, not based on or conceding to political theory, but carried through in practical measures of administration. His views on finance are based on a thorough mastery of the subject, and are not at all tendentious or theoretical. The peasants he recognises to be the body of the state, and in all ways wishes to promote their economic freedom and initiative. For the *intelligentsia*, or educated class, he feels a deep antipathy which culminates in the greatest bitterness against almost all its leaders whatever political tendency they represent, a bitterness which reads like simple personal jealousy. In spite of his opportunism, Witte is thoroughly sound in almost everything that he writes about the non-Russian population of the Empire. He stands up for the old autonomies of his native Caucasus; he pays a remarkable tribute to the singular political ability of the ablest of the Polish leaders, Roman Dmowski, and, most of all, from start to finish he impeaches the monstrous policy of persecution of the Jews. In a most interesting passage, he recounts how he put his view in the baldest way to Alexander III.

Witte's views on empire seem to be almost entirely reactionary, and his attitude to the Russian nationality almost contemptuous. For him, as has been mentioned, the Army is nearly everything and the nation almost non-existent. In foreign policy he is opposed to all mad enterprises, especially to the extraordinary menaces to European peace which it was so often his lot to oppose and sometimes to avert. But if a State is great only by its territory and its army, even the intelligent views of Witte might be hardly less menacing than the mad schemes of Court adventurers. In his foreign policy, it is clear throughout that for England Witte had nothing better than a certain measure of correctness, and that it was his desire to weld Europe into an economic whole from which British influences should be excluded.

This is all that can be said here in a review of this most informing and important book. If one turns one's interest from the writer,

his exploits, feelings and rivalries, to the *milieu* in which he lived and the opportunities which he had for completing our knowledge of it, one finds the book full of valuable contributions, to which justice could only be done in a sketch of the larger subject of Witte's Russia.

BERNARD PARES.

Ruskà Krise (The Russian Crisis). By Dr. Karel Kramář. Prague, 1921.

In the modern Czech national movement the idea of Russia has had an influence at once quickening and disturbing. Russia has had a peculiar attraction for the Czechs ever since they began to dream and work again for the recovery of their independence. The power of the great Empire of the Eastern Slavs was the romantic background which threw into relief the first faint outlines of reviving Czech nationalism. That romantic attitude to Russia has served its purpose and vanished. It has been replaced in these later days by a reasoned, far-sighted sympathy, based on clear knowledge and wide practical experience. Since—four years ago—Czechoslovakia became an independent republic a sensitive interest in Russia has been one of the guiding motives of its policy. Czechoslovak soldiers of the Austro-Hungarian Army surrendered in thousands on the Russian front in order that from them legions might be formed to fight on the side of the Allies. The legions were formed and fought, but in wholly unexpected circumstances. They found themselves compelled to fight against Russians diverted from their allegiance by the Bolsheviks, who, with German aid, had seized power and sought in Russia and through Russia to bring about the defeat of the Allies. On the Volga and in Siberia, the Czechoslovak legions shared in all the vicissitudes of Russian civil war and finally returned home with an extraordinary and intimate experience of Russia.

The thought of Russia is constantly present in Czechoslovakia, whose fortunes and interests are linked up in some special way with those of Russia. And by a strange coincidence, just as the Republic came into being, Russia was caught in a revolutionary turmoil of an unprecedented character. The whole idea of Russia has undergone a remarkable transformation, and, more than most countries, Czechoslovakia needs to understand what is happening in Eastern Europe and what may yet happen.

Fortunately there are among the Czech leaders men who are able to take not merely a practical, but a broad and philosophical view of Russia. No one has given a fuller or more judicious survey of the leading tendencies of Russian thought than President Masaryk, in the work translated into English under the title *The Spirit of Russia*. There is a singular interest in this analysis of the passionate strivings of the Russian intelligentsia, conducted with the sympathy of a

kindred spirit, yet with the detachment of one who is firmly rooted in the traditions of Western civilisation. Written before the War and the Revolution, it yet explains much that has happened since. Now Dr. Kramář has gone a stage further, and has written a book specially devoted to an analysis of the present Russian crisis.

Dr. Kramář knows Russia well. Before the War, at intervals during his parliamentary work in Vienna, he spent months at a time in Russia. He was closely associated with many members of the Russian Duma in the organisation of the Neo-Slav movement in 1908. He is familiar with the language and is thoroughly at home with the Russian intelligentsia. Thus he is in a position to understand, to sympathise and wisely to criticise, and the book he has written is an illuminating commentary on the present state of Russia.

The first part was published in 1918 in the *Česka Revue*, and Dr. Kramář remarks that at that time he could not have believed that "the Bolshevik *régime* would last so many years," nor that "the Allied Powers, after being betrayed at Brest-Litovsk, could leave Russia in the hands of the traitors and not help those who with marvellous heroism tried to wipe out that stain on the good name of the Russian people and to free unhappy Russia from an organisation supported by the enemy." When he resumed his work later, he found fresh material available in the practical results of the Bolshevik experiment. These results he describes, and draws from them lessons for Russia and for the world at large, but especially for Russia. For, as he says, Russia's suffering has been great, far greater than her fault. Her fearful price has been for the rest of mankind a veritable *experimentum crucis*, showing what results follow not only from the false policy of rulers, but from the demagogic incitement of the lowest instincts of the masses—what, too, is the miserable end of an uncompromising application of Socialist watchwords and theories in the life of the State. But, adds Dr. Kramář, "it would be a most terrible crime against Russia if all were to learn from the Russian catastrophe—except the Russians themselves. For those who have grown up in certain traditions and formulæ and in a certain party way of thinking, it is not so easy to abandon everything on which they have hitherto lived, and to live on everything new, wholly new. But Russia cannot be saved unless a new life begins, both among the peasant masses and the intelligentsia. The whole mentality of every Russian must be different from what it has been, otherwise the best Russian blood will have been shed in vain."

In an introductory chapter, Dr. Kramář traces some general causes of the crisis. Russia in the past, he argues, gave no opportunity for the development of individual initiative. Everything conspired to keep the population in a state of inertness and passivity. The long winters and short summers, the monotony of the landscape, the

great, thinly populated spaces, the absence of that intensive urban life which so stimulated the development of civilisation in the West—these were factors that imparted to the Russian character a certain looseness, dreaminess and inactivity. The political and social institutions that were gradually evolved on the Russian plain confirmed these tendencies. Absolutism, built up on the servitude of the peasantry to the gentry, who, until the time of the Empress Catherine, were in a servile relation to the Tsar, gave no room or encouragement to individual initiative. The peasant, fettered by the village commune and by serfdom, had no incentive to continued exertion, since any additional exertion would only benefit others and not himself. The Church, petrified in its traditional theology, and closely linked up with the absolutist state, was concerned only to maintain a dreamy ritual and was the foe of free thought. There was no Renaissance in Russia and no Reformation. Those spontaneous civilising impulses that restrained Western absolutism and made it in the end “enlightened,” did not well up in Russian soil—to humanise and clarify the rude power of the autocracy. Western civilisation percolated into Russia slowly and when it did begin to gather force it gradually produced an educated class which inevitably found itself in antagonism with the traditional Russian state. Hence the revolutionary movement which developed in the twentieth century,—a movement which, persistently hostile in spirit to all that the state stood for, wrecked the state and much besides when in these latter years it came into power. These arguments of Dr. Kramář contain much truth, but not all the truth. In the old Russia not all was brute force on the one side and passivity on the other. The development of the Russian state and Russian culture has followed lines very different from those within which modern Western Europe grew into its present condition. Certain Western qualities were lacking in the process by which Russia was formed, but that does not mean that valuable qualities were not sought out in the long struggle for existence on the great plain. There is a real consonance between the Russian people and its environment, a consonance which is a pledge of continued vitality. The clash of native Russian instincts and habits with Western ideas has led to a terrible catastrophe and has immensely increased the difficulty and complexity of the Russian national task. But the past of Russia that made such a people—dark, though many of its aspects are from the Western point of view—can certainly not have been wholly in vain.

Dr. Kramář would be the first to admit this, even though the logical symmetry of his argument might suffer thereby. Again and again his asides reveal more than his main argument.

“So,” he says, for instance, “in the vivisection of the soul in Russian literature, which gives such an effect of depth and truth, since we feel it to be the simple, inevitable inner need of every Russian, and not merely some special technical skill of Russian writers in

psychological analysis. And in all that the Russian does you may feel the infinite Russian horizons, the distance. Whether in good or evil, everywhere there is the "broad Russian nature" which is not to be confined within the narrow limits of Western discipline or pettiness, which every Russian detests as a repellent 'meshchanstvo' (Herzen) and which makes the Russian so different from us and yet so close to our heart, even when we are horrified at what he does . . . As though we always felt that those 'besy' (demons) had been implanted in the Russian soil by some strange and evil power."

Dr. Kramář's account of the Revolution and of the workings of Bolshevism has life and colour. He draws from his detailed study of the workings of Bolshevism the conclusion that Russian experience has demonstrated the complete collapse of Communism, that this terrible experience has made all classes of society immune against any further Socialist experiments and by completely breaking up old institutions and changing the mentality of workers, peasants and the intelligentsia, may have prepared the way for a rapid development of Russia on new lines so soon as the Bolshevik tyranny is overthrown. In the deepening of religious feeling through the persecution of the Church and as a reaction against the militant atheism of the Bolsheviks Dr. Kramář sees another factor that will powerfully contribute to future revival.

In the last part of the book, Dr. Kramář outlines his views on the future of the Russian State. He insists on the need of Russians being mentally prepared for the work of reconstruction that will become urgently necessary so soon as the Bolsheviks fall, and on his part he makes a number of very interesting suggestions. His project of a new constitution has been published in the Russian press abroad and widely discussed. It provides for an elective Head of the State—who may be a monarch or president—a Central Parliament with an Upper and Lower House, and a number of regional parliaments. It is an abstract scheme, and it is perhaps too early to discuss how far it may ever be carried out in practice. Dr. Kramář merely puts it forward as a suggestion. As he says, the regeneration of Russia must come from within and he reminds the Russian exiles abroad that their political dissensions and pretensions are of slight moment, since it is not they who can now decide the way their country must go. Rather he urges a mental and spiritual preparation for the great tasks ahead. The intelligentsia in particular must abandon its old errors, its narrow sectarian spirit and its unpractical theorising, if it is to recover its due place in a reviving Russia. The peasantry have withstood and repelled the Bolshevik onslaught and efforts must be henceforth chiefly concentrated on the education of this great national force and on the development of its latent energy. Many practical suggestions occur to Dr. Kramář as he surveys the details of this great problem of the future. He looks at the Russian process from various sides and

sets down the thoughts that come to him, without greatly caring whether they be fully rounded or consistent, since no one in our generation, regarding that tremendous and many-sided movement in Russia, can hope to be consistent, or to reduce the tumult in his own mind to any exhaustive and unimpeachable conclusions. All that Dr. Kramář says is inspired by a profound faith in the Russian people and its future.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

RECENT BOOKS ON PUSHKIN AND HIS TIMES.

The interest of Russians in Pushkin seems to have attained its high-water-mark. Dostoyevsky's words "Pushkin is our all-in-all" were never so literally true as they are now. For, indeed, to-day Pushkin stands for Russian civilisation, Pushkin is identified with the whole legacy of a past that is rapidly disappearing, with the Paradise Lost of spiritual culture, of what Fet called "the perfection of puissant thought, the flower of refined life." The passion for Pushkin is so great that the idea naturally suggests itself: is not this love a love forlorn, a last leave-taking before parting for ever? This idea is the pith of Vladislav Khodasevich's remarkable essay *The Wavering Tripod*.¹ Khodasevich prophesies a coming eclipse of Pushkin, an eclipse more complete than was that of the Sixties. The younger generation, he says, has grown up in conditions that preclude the sympathetic understanding of Pushkin, and did not even see the last flickering of the civilisation which had produced him. They are no longer in touch with him, and he is to them a thing of the intangible past. This is a prophecy, and it is impossible to judge to what extent Khodasevich will prove a Cassandra. What we do see is a wonderful revival of the study of Pushkin; if this is a sunset, it is one of extraordinary glory.

Though it would be difficult to prove that the Bolsheviks have as much as a single point in common with Pushkin, they have not failed to take him under their protection. This is of course the work of Lunacharsky, and of his assistant-commissar Bryusov. Bryusov, indeed, is the editor of the official edition of Pushkin, published by the Gosizdat (State Press). We have not been able to obtain a copy of it, but it would seem that it combines all the faults of Bryusov as the communist commissar, with all those of Bryusov as Bryusov. For, on the one hand, Pushkin is commented if not into orthodox communism—at least into a sort of rabid radicalism; and on the other, the editor has given free play to his imagination and to his constructive criticism in building up new poems out of the great poet's foul-copies (chernoviki).

¹ Published in the collection *Pushkin and Dostoyevsky* (*vide infra*) and in *Articles on Russian Poetry* by V. Khodasevich, 1922, which includes two other interesting papers on Pushkin.

The real seat of present-day study of Pushkin is Petrograd, and the Academy of Science is at last expending much intelligent labour on his works. Professor Modest Hoffmann is at the heart of this academic research. He has spent many years over the task, and the results of his work are beginning to appear. The principal of these is *Pushkin, an Introduction to the Study of the Poet*.¹ The enormous interest taken in Pushkin is illustrated by the success of this book: the first edition was out of print in less than a fortnight; the second edition is also out of print. •In fact it turned out to be the best seller of all books published in Russia since the revival of book production, which began, together with the New Economic Policy, in August, 1921. It is not, however, a book of imaginative criticism; it has no literary charm; it is only a plain and intelligent statement of the principles that should be followed by all editors of Pushkin. These principles are simple enough: to give all Pushkin, nothing but Pushkin, and as Pushkin meant it to be given. But however obvious, these principles have never been followed by any editor of Pushkin. This paper is preceded by a short but suggestive introduction giving a rapid survey of the problems raised by the study of Pushkin. What took the public by storm was certainly only the author's genuine love for and genuine knowledge of Pushkin.

Professor Hoffmann announces a new edition of Pushkin's lyrics. At present he has published (for the Academy Press) the text (with a commentary) of Pushkin's posthumous lyrics of 1833-6. It is startling to discover how much non-Pushkin has been smuggled into Pushkin, from the emendations of Zhukovsky to the "reconstructions" of Bryusov. Some of our best known texts are not due to Pushkin but to inattentive proof-readers or to imaginative editors.

Another first-rate contribution of Professor Hoffmann to the knowledge of Pushkin is the publication of the MSS. belonging to A. F. Onegin.² Besides much interesting material (MSS. of poems that had been known only by the printed text), it includes two perfectly new poems. This book is published by the "Pushkin House" attached to the Academy of Science (Pushkinsky dom pri Akademii Nauk), an institution which was founded in 1913, but has especially flourished during the last ten years. Among its numerous publications relating to Pushkin, one must be singled out for its more than usual scholarship. This is a new edition of the *Gavriiliada*, edited by B. Tomashevsky. Besides giving for the first time a reliable text of Pushkin's obscene and blasphemous poem, it contains a remarkable excursus by the editor on the history of the poem. This is an outstanding contribution to the history of the genesis and evolution of Pushkin's poetical style. It may be a pity that all this scholarship is expended on the *Gavriiliada*, of which in later years the poet was so

¹ *Pushkin, Pervaya glava nauki o Pushkine*. Petrograd, 1922. 2nd ed. (*ibidem* 1922).

² *Unpublished Pushkin (Neizdannyy Pushkin)*. Petrograd, 1922.

ashamed, and which he so stoutly disavowed. But if we had every work of Pushkin's edited and annotated in the way Tomashevsky has edited and annotated the *Gavriiliada*, we might be able to boast that we knew something about Pushkin as a poet.

Another publication of the *Pushkinsky dom* is a little collection of essays by various authors on Pushkin and Dostoyevsky (*Pushkin, Dostoyevsky*. Petrograd, 1921). It opens with a declaration signed by a galaxy of "cultural" institutions, proclaiming Pushkin to be the nation's most sacred palladium. Then follows a beautiful introductory poem by M. Kuzmin, an essay on the poet's vocation by the late Alexander Blok, an essay already mentioned by V. Khodasevich (who is, I think, of all modern poets, the one most inspired with the spirit of Pushkin and his times); an article on Pushkin's social and political views by Koni, at present the *doyen* of Russian letters; and a very remarkable essay by Eichenbaum, a member of the young school of "criticism of form," on Pushkin's style. Besides, there is a very interesting article on Dostoyevsky by A. Gornfeld. The "Pushkin House" is now the Museum of all Russian literature, and the central archive for the MSS. of all Russian writers. Specimens of its treasures are exhibited in its Almanach for 1922, "The Rainbow" (*Raduga*), and special publications have been devoted to Nekrasov and Delvig. Delvig was Pushkin's best friend and school-fellow, and it was after his death that Pushkin wrote:

And now, methinks, my turn has come,
For my dear Delvig calls for me.

As a poet Delvig was highly esteemed by Pushkin, but soon forgotten by the reading public. He seems to be now enjoying a revival of interest. This would be only just. For Delvig was a poet of powerful originality, of great daring, and one of the greatest masters of form that ever wrote in Russian. Professor Hoffmann, in his introduction, endeavours to give a just appreciation of this hitherto wronged poet. Another book on Delvig is edited by Professor Yuri Verkhovsky,¹ who has devoted all his life to the study of the "Poets contemporary with Pushkin." This is the title of an anthology edited by him (*Poety Pushkinskoy Pory*. Moscow, 1919). It is preceded by an essay of the editor's, explaining his conception of the Pushkin period and his plan of the Anthology. He divides the poets of the time into three groups: the "plastics," the "singers," and the "thinkers." At the head of each of these groups he places respectively the three greatest poets of Pushkin's generation—Delvig, Yazykov and Baryatynsky. This system is, of course, in many ways arbitrary, and much of his classification of various poets in this or that group might be challenged. One would have preferred a less "subjective" scheme. Moreover Professor Verkhovsky overlooks the real groupings that existed at the time: thus, for instance, Katenin, Griboyedov and Küchelbecher

¹ *Delvig*. Petrograd, 1922.

formed a very real unit of literary Tories, opposed to the innovations of Romanticism and to the "French levity" of the true Pushkinites. These three poets are, however, placed by Professor Verkhovsky each in a different group. But these are venial offences, and so is the omission or the under-representation of some important poets; Khomyakov, for instance, is omitted, and Glinka quite inadequately represented. The book remains a real mine of the best period of Russian poetry, and many poets are here for the first time introduced into an anthology, while others receive ampler justice than they have so far met with. Küchelbecher, in particular, Pushkin's school-fellow, and one of the Decembrists, emerges bigger than he has as yet been supposed to be. It is very unfortunate that the notes which had been prepared for this book by the editor had to be omitted owing to difficulties of printing. But even as it is, the anthology is a first-rate contribution to the history of Russian poetry.

D. S. MIRSKY.

Koń na wzgórzu (*The Horse on the Hill*). By Eugeniusz Małaczewski. 2nd edition. Warsaw (Gebethner and Wolff), 1921.

A TRAGIC interest attaches itself to the little book of short stories that under the title *The Horse on the Hill* has won an immense popularity in Poland. During the first years of the war the author fought in the Russian army; later, in one of the Polish detachments that, after the downfall of Tsarism, appeared all over Russia. When the Bolsheviks came into power, he struggled on foot to the Murman, and fought Red Russia by the side of the British, Polish, and French. His last act was to take part in the defence of his country against the Bolshevik invasion; his career of brilliant literary promise ended with his death from consumption at the age of twenty-six.

These stories range more or less through the two subjects of the war on the Murman and the war nearer home—the conflict, spiritual and physical, of Poland with Bolshevism. Their psychology is typically Polish. They are instinct with the extraordinary vitality of the Polish race, with the youth and elasticity of a people who have seen at close quarters and personally suffered horrors of which we English have little conception, and who yet can resume life with gaiety. On the other hand, Małaczewski inherits the mysticism that is said to be born with every Pole, and which gives his work a closer moral affinity with the spiritualised patriotism of the great Messianic poets of Poland than any recent product of Polish literature. It is here that Małaczewski effects his greatest success. He is more at home on his high peaks of patriotic vision than in his rough-and-tumble, somewhat obvious humours of a soldier's life. At the root of all he writes is a profound, indeed an impassioned, love of his country. It invests the commonplace with unexpected

flashes of a light beyond; it is even at the background of the biography of a Polar bear; it creates an immortal scene—such as that of the Christmas Eve in the Polish blockhouse amidst the Russian snows. The jokes die on the lips of the Polish soldiers when, sitting round the rude makeshifts for the traditional Polish Christmas Eve supper, they remember and yearn for Poland. Drink restores animation to the party. Their commandant bursts upon them. They think he is drunk; and so he is, but not with alcohol; he gasps out in broken accents that a Polish Government is formed in Warsaw, that Poland will be free.

“ ‘ Someone hold me! I shall go mad! ’

“ And he did go mad—if tears streaming down a soldier’s face is madness.”

Again, Małaczewski is a true son of Poland in his handling of atmosphere. He delights in painting the frozen seas, the flashing of the aurora over snow-covered plains. Thus, in the delightful tale of Baska, the bear. “ At the decline of the Polar day of two hours, when the sun was setting over the bay, Baska stood on the shore. . . . She gazed out to the west, towards the blood-red and violet fires. The glaciers, barricading the bay from the open sea, were like flowers of coloured lights, were as though covered with drooping beds of hyacinths. The water looked like a great peacock tail, wherein unnumbered sparklets swarmed and leaped.” The bear floats down the Arctic Ocean and reaches Archangel, where she becomes the pet and mascot of one of the Polish regiments fighting in North Russia. The regiment is ordered home; the bear goes with them. They receive an ovation in Warsaw; so does the bear. Then the end comes. She is taken to bathe in the Vistula. The river, lit by the setting sun, seems to her the bay that was her first home, and the forest on the further bank “ the ocean murmuring far, far distant. The call of eternal nature, the same in its power from pole to pole, bade her child, astray among mankind, return.”

She swims out, wanders to a peasant village, and is killed for the sake of her fur.

The finest of the stories is that where the author takes a scene, familiar to the countless Poles who have languished in Bolshevik prisons, and invests the last hours of two Polish brothers before they are shot down like dogs by their jailors with the austere dignity of self-sacrifice and the tenderness of human and patriotic love. The two young Cracow students, soldiers of Haller’s iron brigade, stand at the grated window of the prison, while the other prisoners, all Russians, sleep, or sit hopeless and apprehensive, waiting for the soldiers to lead three of their number out to execution. The nervous tension inside the prison: the horrible silence that will only be broken by the messengers of death: then the tramp of the soldiers’ boots: the binding of the victims’ hands: the last shot outside in the courtyard, after which every nerve relaxes, and the prisoners

whose turn will come to-morrow lie down, relieved, to sleep—all this is related with a simplicity that is strength. The brothers are conducted to the red tribunal, whose condemnation is a foregone conclusion; the secretary who interprets is the mistress of the commissary, a Polish woman of the streets. She is ashamed to look her compatriots in the face; but, as she repeats their depositions in Russian, her eyes involuntarily meet theirs.

“And a miracle befell, as old as the Polish captivity. The undying Polish spirit, the fraternity of Lechite blood, which in one given moment will unexpectedly take possession of the greatest renegade, the vilest body—that spark of Poland, unconscious of itself, suddenly blossomed in the sad heart of the fallen woman.” She tries to save them; but in vain. They are sentenced to be shot the following dawn. They are taken back to prison, through the crowds who are enjoying themselves in the sunny streets. “What did it matter to any of these that those two white-faced men walking between bayonets, with mortally wearied looks, in rags of uniforms . . . were gazing at this sunlit world with farewell eyes for ever?” Now that the last thread of hope had snapped, they stagger a little as they walk; they clench their teeth so that no sign of their anguish of regret for their young lives may disgrace themselves and Poland. The night in the prison is a replica of the last, except that it is they who are now the centre of attraction, because it is they who are going to be fetched out to die. Then a great fear comes upon the elder brother lest the younger, who before the war was a dreamy poet, will die unworthy of Poland by showing the white feather at his death. He speaks to him with passionate eloquence of the country for which he is to die. At his words, ‘death ceased to exist for them.’

“To die with serenity at the hands of murderers,” says the author, “you must be a soldier of Christ or a soldier of a great country. Either the radiance of the Cross must shine over the head of the condemned, or else the age-long symbol of his native land. . . . The brothers, brought up in times when religion was laughed at, and the tradition of their fathers wiped out from the minds of the young by European philosophy . . . sent no prayer to God that would have returned as a dove of peace to lay on the despairing heart the olive branch of sweet consolation. But, because they were soldiers in the service of the Republic not yet risen from the dead, at their first thought of her she came—radiant, splendid, the realisation of dreams.” The boy poet is enraptured by the vision of the nation who will not die, though her sons die. Wherever, he says, “the last gibbet shines, the last salvo sounds, is the city of Poland’s soul, the centre of a better Poland.”

Małaczewski pushes his spiritual convictions a step further in the last story of the book. He gives them in the form of a soldier’s memoirs who had witnessed the unutterable atrocities perpetrated

during the Bolshevik invasion on his country, his home, his family. These sights send him, mad for revenge, into delirium: finally, out of the very iniquities he had beheld, he evolves the conclusion that reborn Poland can only be built on the foundation of love. Taking as a symbol a horse mutilated beyond recognition by the Bolsheviks that he has seen standing on a hill—hence the name of the book—and that has haunted him ever since, he argues: Is not the soul of the men who have done these things more hideous even than the deeds themselves? "Have I, professing the precept, an eye for an eye, a more perfect soul than theirs?" Is not the Polish nation, if she would carry on her historical calling as defender of Christianity and civilisation in the East, compelled to vanquish the representatives of barbarism by a morality higher than anything they know? Here we have Małaczewski's spiritual programme for Poland, confronted with Bolshevism: the more remarkable as laid down by a young soldier who had seen with his own eyes the horrors that he describes, and who yet can conclude his life-work with these last lines: "We shall see the highest love face to face. We are at the door."

MONICA M. GARDNER.

The Ballads of Marko Kraljević. Translated by D. H. Low, formerly Lecturer in English at Belgrade University. Cambridge (Univ. Press), 1922. Pp. xxxix + 196. 15s. net.

It is but natural that the magnificent ballad poetry of the Jugoslavs should make an appeal to British readers, and Mr. Low is to be congratulated on this new and scholarly contribution to the subject. The first to acquaint Western Europe with these hidden treasures was the Italian Abbate Fortis, who, himself a keen admirer of Ossian, published his "Travels into Dalmatia" at Venice in 1774 and included a few translations of ballads from the Croatian coast. On these versions Herder and Goethe based their fine renderings of "The Lament of Hasan Aga's Wife" and other ballads. The first English translations from Serbo-Croat were published by Sir John Bowring in 1827, after Vuk Karadžić had begun his epoch-making work; and though for the most part wooden and uninspired, deserve the credit due to all honest pioneer work. In 1861 "Owen Meredith," guided by the sure instinct of a poet, produced a small volume of Serbian National Songs, charming in feeling, but avowedly bearing little or no resemblance to the original; and since then Mme. Mijatović, Mr. Mügge and Miss Rootham have tried their hands at translation. But the cycle of ballads relating to Marko Kraljević, whom Mr. Low quite rightly regards as "the best-beloved of all the old traditional heroes," has never before been presented in English garb, though the hero himself, and his fabulous piebald charger Šarac, are known to us through the works of Ivan Meštrović.

There are many other Serbian ballads which strike a higher note than those of the Marko cycle—for instance, Tsar Lazar's choice of a heavenly kingdom, or the lament of the mother of the Jugović. But Marko has "somehow or other" found his way to the heart of every Serb, as a symbol of national resistance to the Turk. He shares with the age to which he belongs a certain savagery and love of devious ways: "there are no fine shades or subtle distinctions" about him, and "the contrasts are hard and violent." His punishment of Leka's foulmouthed sister may perhaps be allowed to pass, but his treatment of the Moorish princess is treachery of the deepest dye, for which he at least had qualms of conscience. Yet Mr. Low may fairly claim that, judged by xivth century Balkan ballads, Marko is remarkable for his honesty and high moral courage, his eagerness to redress wrong and champion the oppressed, his filial devotion, his kindness to animals. The blunt reprimand administered to his comrade-in-arms Beg Kostadin, for what we should now call his snobbery (p. 85), bears witness that the democratic tradition of the Serb is no new thing. Above all, there is about Marko and the ballads that celebrate his prowess an amazing vitality, which helps us to understand how Serbia survived the Turkish yoke. He and all his race have always been "bonnie fechtters," or, as the ballad has it, he fought "like a falcon among doves." Even Šarac saw red, for Marko and his charger shared the wine equally between them, till Šarac "grew blood-red to the ears."

In the actual work of translation, Mr. Low has tried to steer between the "two obvious dangers" of "fine writing" and "baldness," but his modesty sometimes leads him to strive unduly towards the latter, and I personally regard his direct style and happy choice of phrase as a proof that he might safely have aimed higher. As it is, he sometimes falls between two stools and pulls up the reader by an all too literal rendering. Moreover, in his desire to impart an archaic flavour, he occasionally oversteps the mark. Surely "every each" and "one by other" and "whether of them" (for "which of them") are mere mannerisms or worse; and "driving to fore him" and "whither him listeth" do not strike me as English at all. "They halsed each other in arms" pleases *me*, but ought it to be allowed? And "if we would find the Tsar *on live*" may be Chaucerian, but does it deserve to be brought into modern use? In any case the ballad-lover will find in this book a source of keen enjoyment, and it is to be hoped that Mr. Low will dig further in the rich field of Yugoslav popular poetry.

R. W. SETON-WATSON.

Grammaire de la Langue tchèque. By André Mazon. Paris (Champion). 1921. Pp. 252.

THIS grammar belongs to a series published by the "Institut d'Etudes Slaves," and deals with the present-day literary language "as it is

written and spoken by the average educated Czech." The author is not concerned with dialects, but refers occasionally to colloquial forms. In a short introduction, speaking of the extension of the Czech language and of the close relationship between Czech and Slovak—"dialectes d'une même unité linguistique et non point langues différentes"—he estimates the Czech-speaking population at 10,500,000. Prof. Mazon is a well-known authority on Russian, but in Czech also his success is beyond question. This is surely the best grammar of modern Czech ever written by a foreigner. Particularly able is the tenth section on the verbal system, especially his lucid exposition of the intricate subject of aspect differentiation—with such an authority on aspects it could not be otherwise. Another important feature is his regard for what Zachrisson calls "stilarter." He does not confuse the student with archaisms. It is only too natural that the author of an interesting dictionary of Russian war and Revolution slang has a keen feeling for stylistic niceties. He distinguishes various types of speech: obsolete, ecclesiastic, bookish (*livresque*), written language, as opposed to familiar, spoken, average, actual, current, normal, popular and vulgar style. Though he is not quite consistent his stylistic remarks are of great practical value to the student of colloquial Czech. Curiously enough he did not apply this principle in the section dealing with sounds, where several types of pronunciation are usually distinguished by phoneticians. The ideal of modern language teaching, as expounded by Mr. H. E. Palmer and others, is to enable the student to use the foreign language in such a way that the natives do not consider him as a foreigner. In France we are often struck by the correctness of speech even among uneducated people. Prof. Smetánka observes in the introduction to his valuable little Czech grammar (*Sammlung Göschel*) that the Czech colloquial language generally has "dialectal colouring," *i.e.*, the living language even among educated classes departs sometimes from the traditional spelling. The spelling pronunciation—which is otherwise considered the only orthoepical standard of such words as *vousy*, *léto*, *mléko*, *strýček*, *pošta*, *pijte*, *ještě*, *hřebík*, *dobré jitro*, etc., sounds stiff and pedantic in normal conversation. You cannot say that forms like *mlíko*, etc., are vulgar. Even the diphthongised pronunciation of *ý* which M. Mazon stamps as a Prague popular form, is frequently used throughout the country, even by educated people. The student who has to understand the man in the street must know also the phonetic peculiarities of the actually spoken language. It is a drawback of grammars written by native grammarians that they do not approach these questions with an open mind. (Even in the Czech Berlitz book we meet with such bookish forms as "jest".) On the whole, M. Mazon does not enter into a detailed phonetic analysis of Czech sounds. He is content to give the rules of the conventional spelling pronunciation from the French standpoint.

But as mentioned above, he is primarily concerned with the literary language, for which spelling pronunciation is the only acknowledged standard. He did not even think it necessary to devise a phonetic notation or to adopt that of the International Phonetic Association. It is, indeed, hardly necessary in a spelling, the diacritic signs of which were adopted not only by other nations, but have been found convenient even for scientific sound notation of various remote languages. He evidently considers Czech spelling phonetic enough to interpret the respective sounds. (Among its chief etymological difficulties he ought to mention (p. 8) also the purely etymological use of the prepositions *z* and *s*.) That is the reason why orthoepy has received hitherto so little consideration. (A Moravian pronounces *jsme* as *zme* instead of *sme*, *shoda* as *zhoda* instead of *skhoda*.) Still, M. Mazon notes some cases where current pronunciation differs from the spelling, e.g., *sedum*, *osum*, instead of *sedm*, *osm*. (He ought to make it clear (p. 82), however, that these forms are not permitted in the written language.) He gives p. partic. *vedl* as an example of a syllabic *l* along with *vlna*. It should, however, be pointed out in this connection that the spoken language first unvoiced and then dropped this sort of *l*. (Similarly in words like *jablko*, *mučed(l)ník*: the spelling of the latter word only recently conformed to current pronunciation.)

The chapter on phonetic changes is very lucid. The same tendency to make complicated things simple is seen in the way he deals with the declension of nouns. He made a successful attempt to bring symmetry into the treatment of Czech declension, which was rather complicated by peculiar vowel changes. He also gives some interesting details not usually found in grammars, e.g., fem. adj. with masc. nouns in a depreciating sense.

He does justice to the actual language, stating the colloquial use of nominative instead of vocative after *pane* (p. 98). Also he remarks justly (p. 98) that the negative genitive is found solely in the literary language. Notwithstanding his clear exposition of the cases, there might occasionally arise a misunderstanding. When he says (p. 32): “L'accusatif répond à la question *où* (avec mouvement)” it may, as it stands, create an erroneous impression as if there were such constructions as Lat. *Romam*. It is debatable whether the form *mužský* = man, *ženská* = woman can be marked as vulgar. As a matter of fact, colloquial language has got in these elliptical forms a means of distinguishing between husband, wife (*muž*, *žena*) and man, woman (*muž*, *žena* in liter. lang.)

Stavové = *états* (p. 71): a capital letter in the French word would perhaps avoid misunderstanding. “V kterém usě mně zní” (p. 51) would sound rather quaint in Prague—“v uchu” is by far the most usual form. *Vlachy* for Italy (p. 97) is now obsolete, except in the adjectival form *vlašský* (formerly written phonetically *vlaský*) in terms like *v. salát*, *v. ožech*, *V. dvůr* (at Kutná Hora), *Vlašská ulička*

(in Prague). Bookish is "tento," but so are also forms like "naň, veň, jej" and especially accus. neutr. "je" (it), both the latter forms being supplanted by "ho." The form "tré" is purely archaic and would look ludicrous in conversation. The ending *-ěř* (*bankéř*) (p. iii) is left out. The author does not mention hybrid formations like *hrubián* (this word seems to be adopted from German, like most abusive terms and slang words in Czech), *autorství*, *luxusní*, *kolonisovati*, etc. Indeed loan-words, which play such an important part in modern life, would deserve more attention. For an adjective (p. 75) beside the current term *adjectivum* the term *přídavné jméno* is used, never only *přídavné*. I can find no reference to the use of possessive adjectives, and his remarks on p. 102 are rather misleading. It seems as if that form could be used also about inanimate things. It is not expressly stated that it is possible only in connection with persons and single words except the archaic combinations with *páně*. He gives the form *novákovi* (p. 121), denoting members of the same family, but he does not say anything about the frequent patronymic (now also possessive) ending *-ic* (which remains unchanged in Czech, but forms plural in Slovak, *-ici*).

In the classification of verbs Mazon has adopted the present stem criterion, instead of the more practical system of six categories devised by Dobrovský and Miklosich, and generally followed by Czech grammarians. The stumbling-block of every foreigner, the verb aspects, have received a scholarly treatment. In a section on the modification of meaning through prefixes the author gives numerous examples of the shades of meaning imparted by the prefixes. They are sometimes very subtle and evasive. I may, perhaps, indicate some slight inaccuracies: *nalovím* (p. 219) is only applicable to hunting or angling; *oblbl* is hardly used—should be, *zblbl*; *oblbil* (transitive) is possible; *přepracován* means simply "surmené"; *rozložím* means also "j'étalerai"; *rozvinu* means also "dérouler, déployer"; "*snímati*" is purely literary, the colloquial word for *taking down* is *sundavati* (which has been lately vindicated by Prof. Zubatý); *uraziti* does not mean *to strike*, but *to knock off* or *to offend*; *ubíti* (unlike Russian *ubit'*) has only the original meaning "frapper jusqu'à tuer," not *to kill* in general, which is *zabíti*; *vzejdu* (p. 222) is used only figuratively, and cannot be used about persons: "*vzejde den*"—a day will arise (liter.), "*obíli vzejde*," etc.; "*je monterai*" is *vystoupím*; *zanesl* does not necessarily imply *to carry something to the wrong place*, but also simply *to deliver something somewhere*, it also means *to make an entry*, etc.; *zahleděti se* generally means "fixer son regard sur." While he notes various niceties of the use of imperfective preterite (p. 228), he ought to mention that it sometimes gives emphasis to a statement (like progressive form in English: *určitě jsem ti to dával*—I did give it to you). He introduces a very useful term "perfectible," denoting verbs liable to aspect-differentiation. It is interesting to observe that those loan-words which are perfectible are *eo ipso* assimilated as

a part of the language (e.g. zatelefonoval, vyfotografoval). Learned words such as akcentovati, akceptovati, financovati, etc., are imperfectible. *Vyčítám* (p. 200) means also "reprocher." The compound forms of *létati* (why not also *létati*?) are not always perfective: *ptáci přilétají* (or *přilétají*), corresponding to Russian "ptitsy priletayut" (imp.), is either imp. and equal to *ptáci přiletují* or perfective—in the latter case the meaning implied is: the birds will come one after another (consecutive flight home). A familiar form, *lítl* instead of *letěl*, to indicate a swift motion, flight, run, could also be recorded. Sometimes even verbs that are considered usually "imperfectible" can be made perfective, like *doufati* (*opět zadoufal* = he began again to hope). In the recent literary language some artificial forms (such as *zapůsobiti*) have penetrated, surely against the genius of the language. Speaking about *plouti* and the new formation *plovati* (pp. 164, 165) he ought perhaps to mention the old and more frequent form *plavati*, to swim. I can find no reference to the forms "ty ses" and "sis." There are many delicate *nuances* in the usage of aspect; thus *měnit* means simply to change (imp.), whereas *proměnit* and *změnit* both mean to change altogether (perf.), but the first implies a change of substance (*vodu ve víno* = water into wine) whereas the latter means to change quality (e.g., *barvu* = colour).

Unless the morphology and employment of Czech aspects receive an exhaustive and systematic treatment in the way of a synopsis of all deviations and their semantic variants, an efficient study of Czech is impossible, without continually resorting to a native teacher. We cannot help thinking that this task could be best effected by some of M. Mazon's pupils, preferably in connection with a born Czech. We do not know any Czech dictionary which takes into consideration the foreigner's helplessness in this particular direction. Such a work, which ought to pay attention also to Mr. Trávníček's recent investigations, would once for all remove the greatest handicap for the French students of Czech. It is true that aspect distinctions can be better expressed in English than in French, and a thorough Czech-English dictionary would certainly meet an urgent need of all students of Czech.

Nothing essential has been left out, and the references to the spoken language are valuable: but sometimes we find slight inconsistencies or omissions. The author gives "přáti" as a verb combined with genitive (p. 704), but on p. 146 he quotes the greeting "dobré jitro přeji" without any comment. On the whole, it may be said that the use of genitive has been actually limited in such cases to reflective verbs (though "přáti si," to wish, is also used with accus. in coll. Czech). We say "vážiti si matky," but "litovati matky" would give an impression of plural to an average Czech. Most verbs tabled out in grammars as requiring genitive construction in the current language are combined with accusative. The same tendency can be seen in some Russian verbs. The old construction is, however,

strictly observed in standard language. Though the author distinguishes as a rule between obsolete forms, such as *vrhu*, he gives (p. 154) such an unusual term as “*břísti blátem*.” *Pomníti*, like *slouti*, is now obsolete (p. 101). Nor does the word *činiti* belong to the conversational style, except *činiti se*, meaning “to do one’s best.” It ought to be pointed out that *řku* is only used in the formula *jářku* (= I say, rather vulgar), whereas the infinitive *řici* is commonly used. *Vědom* does not mean “su” in modern Czech, but “conscient,” *vědomý* = deliberate, but *povědomý* means rather known. In the enumeration of the verbal prepositions, *v ve* (p. 217), is left out. The author is right to record the only natural analogical form, *píšu, píšou, kupuju*, etc. The standard forms must be upheld and used in their proper place, but they cannot be reasonably enforced in colloquial speech. Purely literary survivals, archaisms, subsisting in noble or poetical style, are sometimes marked by an asterisk, and, on the other hand, the universal deviations of the spoken language are recorded, e.g., generalisation of the palatalisation (*třu, třou*, is, indeed, the only possible form in spoken Czech, though it is still a “taboo” in literary language.) It is to be regretted that the author did not carry out this scheme throughout his book.

The part dealing with sentences which includes conjunctions does not call for much comment. As for the arrangement of word-order, the shifting of enclitics towards the head of the sentence requires more attention. Among the examples illustrating the subjective element in Czech word-order, those taken from Jirásek and Neruda do not exhibit a natural style. Even modern writers sin against the natural rhythm of the language, which avoids, e.g., the artificial order substantive and adjective (*kniha česká, slavnost ta*), or mismanagement of enclitics, etc. In a sentence like “*já jsem se ho na to neptal*,” the order of the unstressed words is as fixed and firm as in “*je ne le lui ai pas demandé*.” The number of enclitics and unstressed pronouns is greater than M. Mazon indicates (p. 240). The sequence of enclitics is by no means arbitrary, but definite rules have not yet been formulated. In normal speech we cannot change the established order. As for the conjunction *však* (Lat. *tamen*), it belongs to the literary speech. In colloquial language *však* is placed always at the top of a sentence, meaning “surely,” or “certainly,” or “never fear,”—e.g., “*však já vím*,” emphatically. On the other hand, the author pays due attention to the negation. A frequent source of errors indeed—especially to those acquainted with Yugoslav languages—is the formation of negative preterite (*cf.*, Serb, *nisam bio*; Sl., *nisam bil*; Czech, *nebyl jsem*).

As for the modern arrangement of the grammar, M. Mazon has been right to depart from the conventional system of nine parts of speech. He evidently reserves the interjections for a dictionary, but, without an index, the average reader will have some difficulty in finding conjunctions in the section on sentences, or prepositions in the section

on cases. The book was printed in Prague, and this, perhaps, accounts for the absence of errors in Czech words (I have found only two slight misprints in French). This is very important in a grammar. Morfill's English grammar of Czech, though memorable as the pioneer work of a noble enthusiast, must be used with discretion, since every page contains mistakes. Indeed, it could only be profitably used if a complete list of errata were added.

O. VOČADLO.

Zur Chronologie der štokavischen Akzentverschiebung. By Hannes Sköld. Lund, 1922.

AFTER briefly outlining the characteristic accentual difference between the Čakavic and Hercegovinian-Štokavic dialects (*sestrà* : *sèstra*, etc.), the author endeavours to show that recent Štokavic loan-words follow the rules governing accent withdrawal (*cp.* Leskien's formulation in § 214 ff. of his *Serbische Grammatik*) only to the extent that all monosyllabic loans have a falling accent, *e.g.*, *kòr* < Fr. *corps*, *kvit*, and that no word can be accented on the last syllable, *e.g.*, *telègram*, *advòkāt*. Words, however, not originally oxytone preserve in their borrowed form the *original* stress and normally appear with rising accent, *e.g.*, *mašina*. Where the accent is falling—in loans from words with original initial accent, *e.g.*, *màksimum* or *lârma*—the irregularity is due to a conscious application in the case of *mots savants* (*màksimum*, etc.) of the accentual laws of literary Štokavic, or to the influence of Slovenian or Čakavic (*lârma*, etc.).

This new accentual tendency is certainly as old as the XVIIIth century, when *bibliotéka*, *delikátan*, etc., are vouched for and may even go back to the XVIth, by which time the Hercegovinian-Štokavic shift had taken place (*cp.* p. 37).

Before elaborating his own evidence for the dating of the Štokavic shift, the author passes in review the investigations of Daničić, Maretić, Shakhmatov, Belić and Vondrák, and holds that none of these scholars has materially forwarded the problem under discussion.

From a consideration of such forms as *Beògrad*, *veòma*, etc., it would seem that the Štokavic accentual shift had started by the XVth century (—o— for —l— appears in Bosnian archives of the XIVth century), a view which finds support, in the author's opinion, in the fact that the earlier loan-words from Hungarian (for which before the XVIth century oxytonic stress is postulated—*cp.* appendices 1 and 3) and from Osmanli Turkish agree, as regards the syllable accented and the intonation, with the conclusions already reached, *i.e.*, have a rising intonation—except in the case of the Arabic and Persian loans passing into Serbian through Turkish—and show the usual withdrawal of the accent. The majority of the Turkish words having been borrowed in the second half of the XVth century, the *tendency* towards the withdrawal of the accent

could not, therefore, have yet worked itself out. Arguing from this fact, the author of the article here summarised comes then to the following conclusions:—The Štokavic accentual shift originated at the earliest in the XIVth century, persevered for two or three centuries and then gradually lost strength, making itself felt to-day only in the case of originally oxytonic words and in the intonation rule governing monosyllables.

N. B. JOPSON.

A brief reference must be made to two newly published volumes on Czechoslovakia. *The Czechoslovak Republic*, by Jaroslav Císař and F. Pokorný (Fisher Unwin, 1922, pp. 218, illust. and map), contains a most useful survey, not easily obtainable elsewhere, of the "history and geography, political and cultural organisation, and economic resources of the new State. It is based in the main upon official statistics, and is especially strong on the economic side; indeed, those engaged in business dealings with Central Europe will find it almost indispensable. Those again who desire a well written textbook of Czech history cannot do better than turn to *Bohemia: from the Earliest Times to the Foundation of the Czechoslovak Republic* (Fisher Unwin), 1922, pp. 576, 7s. 6d. net), by C. Edmund Maurice, now published in a second edition. It is true that the Czech period subsequent to 1848 is hardly touched upon (only 20 out of 564 pages), but the great periods of Bohemian history are dealt with in a manner altogether superior to that of many parallel volumes in the *Story of the Nations* series. (By a strange error of proof correction, Masaryk is throughout referred to as *Mašaryk*!)

R. W. S. W.

The Christmas season is approaching, and some of our readers may be glad to learn of an attractive volume of Czechoslovak fairy tales, published under the title *The Disobedient Kids* (Prague: B. Koči, 1921, 6s., per Philip Allan & Co., London), with delightful illustrations (eight in colour) by the Czech artist Artuš Scheiner. They are old tales retold by Božena Němcová, and simply and effectively rendered into English by Messrs. Tolman and Smetanka. Some, like the Kids themselves, the Little Cock and Hen, and "Little Thumb," are already familiar to us from Grimm, but they are none the less welcome for that. Quite original surely is the sad little tale of "The Frog and Belinka."

R. W. S. W.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES.

FOREIGN VERDICTS ON RUSSIA.

[In the following brief bibliographical notes, Baron Alexander Meyendorff, who has closely followed the literature in this subject, analyses the more important books and articles dealing with Russian problems, which have appeared in the West since the autumn of 1921. The reader will at once be struck by the singularly uneven standard of the matter under review; but, considering the absence of trustworthy materials from Russia itself, we think that this critical estimate of foreign opinion will be of use to our readers.—ED.]

(a) POLITICS AND ECONOMICS.

Gaillard, Gaston: The Turks and Europe. (From the French edition of August, 1920.) London (Murby), 1921. 408 pp. M. Gaillard, author of *L'Allemagne et le Balticum* (Paris, 1919), deals in Chapter VIII. with the Moslems of the former Russian Empire and Turkey, and argues that the Republic of the Northern Caucasus should have been recognised by the Entente. Chapter IX. (Turkey and the Slavs) is really a history of Russia's gravitation towards Constantinople since Peter the Great (whose spurious Will figures on p. 381). Among the proofs of Russian ambition are quoted the conferences held in November 1913 by the Russian Staff, published by the Bolsheviks (p. 400). "Constantinople is likely to be swallowed up by Russia as soon as her troubles are over, whether she remains Bolshevik or falls under a Tsar's rule again," "and England will find her again in her way in Asia and even on the shores of the Mediterranean" (p. 401). Very carelessly edited; many misprints, especially in dates.

Sirdar Ikbāl Ali Shah: The Bolshevik Menace in the Middle East. (*Contemporary Review*, October, 1921.) Thinks that no good purpose is to be served by denying that Bolshevism has achieved at least a temporary triumph in the Middle East, and states "that Bolshevik endeavour has been quite as active in Afghanistan as in Turkestan," but that the Afghans "are becoming tired of Soviet interference in their affairs."

Lutoslawski, M.: Le Péril Allemand en Russie. (*Revue des deux Mondes*, 1 April, 1922.) Gives a historical survey of the organisation of German commercial interests, the consolidation of Germany's position after the treaty of 1894 and the supplementary treaty of 1904, which, though correct in the main lines, underestimates or ignores the Russian tariff policy, as shown by the draft of the tariff of 1903. The author is especially to the point when he draws the horoscope of what happened two weeks later at Rapallo and calls attention to the trade arrangement of May, 1921, between Germany and Soviet Russia.

Struve, Peter: The Russian Communistic Experiment. (*Edinburgh Review*, October, 1921.) "The reaction towards primitive economy, produced in Russia by the Communist régime, has no parallel in the history of the world (p. 231). Two stages or periods stand out distinctly. In the first—the elemental enthusiasm and intoxication of the masses moved by their primitive instincts, and a conscious gambling on the parts of the leading circles" (p. 234). The second stage "is a period of construction by State coercion without the participation of the emotions and the will of the masses, exclusively through the agency of a party minority" (p. 235). He discusses the transition from workmen's control

to State management, the "bourgeoisisation and militarisation of labour," and the abandonment of the principle of equality in remuneration. The experiment has shown that Socialism, if at all, is possible only if the principle of economic inequality be systematically applied (p. 239). There will be an end of independent trade unions and the freedom of trade conceded to agricultural producers, owing to the abolition of private property.

Marriott, J. A. R., M.P. : *The Economics of Communism : Theory and Practice.* (*Fortnightly Review*.) "The real danger in this country arises, not from the bad people who know where they are going, but from the good people who do not; not so much from hard heads as from 'soft hearts'; is this not what Struve calls 'conscious gambling'?"

Scott, A. MacCallum, M.P. : *The Russian Slave State.* (*Fortnightly Review*, January, 1922.) "Making full allowance for the effects of civil and external war, the Allied blockade and the collapse of Tsardom, it cannot be denied, and it is not denied by the Bolshevik leaders themselves, that the drastic application of Bolshevik theory has failed so far to produce anything like the promised social millennium in Russia." Referring to "the profound change with regard to the treatment of the individual workman," he writes, "in fact there has been established a regular system of payment by results analogous to piece-work, which is the feature of capitalist wage slavery most violently denounced by Socialism." Author's authorities: Trotsky, *Terrorism and Communism* (published June, 1920); Lenin, *Childish Ailments of Progressivism in Communism* (May, 1920), and A. I. Rykov's statements at the Moscow Congress (January, 1920).

Vanderlip, Frank A. : *What Next in Europe?* (L. Allen.) *Economic Chaos: Russia and the Near East* (pp. 161-177). Only interesting because of the author's reputation as a big business man; he probably passes under silence what he knows best.

Trotsky, L., and Varga, E. : *The World Economic Situation.* (*Labour Monthly*, August, 1921.) "The elements of stability, of conservatism and of tradition have to a considerable extent lost their power over the minds of the labouring man. It is true that Social Democracy and Trade Unions still exercise some influence . . . but this influence, as well as that of the proletariat itself, has undergone . . . changes in no way consistent with the 'step by step' methods of the pre-war period."

The Russian Economist : Journal of the Russian Economic Association in London. Published quarterly by P. S. King & Son since autumn, 1920 : up to July-September four numbers have been issued, making a bulky volume of 1,466 pages. The most complete collection of all available materials concerning economic conditions in Soviet Russia, and subjected to close examination by well-informed writers. (Is about to resume publication in Russian only.)

Russian Life. A review of facts and documents relating to the Russian situation; edited by the Russian Liberation Committee since August, 1921. Gives probably the most complete collection of facts and documents of Russia now available, being a continuation of *The New Russia*, which covered the period from January to December, 1920. Several prominent Russian writers contribute articles, stating the case against Bolshevism.

Belloc, Hilaire : *The Jews.* (Constable), 1922. 308 pp. The thesis of this book is that the only possible and true solution of the Jewish problem is the segregation of the Jews on friendly and careful lines, and this he defines as "recognition." The anti-Semitic movement, he argues, is powerful because it accumulates evidence against the Jews; of this "evidence," the Revolution in Russia will be the historical point of

departure, whence will date the renewed hostility to the Jew in Western Europe, because it is a Jewish movement, *though not a movement of the Jewish race* (pp. 53-65, 167-185). The author tries to explain why the Jews, inspired partly by vengeance, partly by their international mentality, have captured what remains of Russian government. "I believe that had the former Russian Government treated the Jews as I say they should be treated, it would be in power to-day" (p. 185). If it were not for the author's reputation, the book might well remain unnoticed.

The Jews and the Russian Revolution. (*National Review*, December, 1921.) By a recent resident in Russia, an article of no special value, directed against the identification of the Russian Jews with the Bolsheviks. In his eagerness to defend them, the author is ready to accuse without sufficient evidence other non-Russian nationalities; he would have done better to disentangle the misconceptions likely to result from the statements of Mrs. Snowden or Mr. Bechhofer regarding the pre-eminence of the Jewish element in the Bolshevik bureaucracy.

(b) HISTORY.

The following books and articles are grouped in the chronological order of the events to which they refer. The Memoirs of Count Witte and A. Izvolsky, as well as Lord Salisbury's biography and M. Paléologue's *La Russie des Tsars pendant la Grande Guerre*, must be reserved for special treatment. Of the books published by former officials of the Secret Service, some information may be gathered from *Red Dusk and the Morrow* by Sir Paul Dukes (Williams and Norgate, 1922); while Captain Blennerhassett's novel, *The Red Shadow*, is a perplexing blend of truth and fiction.

The famine literature—with its basic motto, "the menace of Bolshevism to our civilisation may be disarmed by generosity"—has been left outside the scope of these notes.

Williamson, James A.: A Short Story of British Expansion. (Macmillan), 1922. In Part II. the author deals with "North-eastern Discovery and the Muscovy Company."

Wolff, Lucien: Life of the First Marquess of Ripon. 2 vols. (Murray), 1921. "The case against Russia"—quotations from Lord Ripon's fragmentary MS. "Wild Oats," 1853, v. 2, p. 80)—in which he writes of "that great, grim, shadowy Power which sits brooding over Asia and Europe. . . . The real and sufficient reason why the English people . . . has gone to war with Russia, is because they have suddenly awakened to the conviction of that which many men have long seen and known . . . to restrain the power of Russia . . . which threatens the freedom and progress of all Europe." He proposes a Prussian Alliance (p. 83), and argues that Russia should be rendered permanently innocuous by restoring the independence, or effecting the reunion with their parent states, of her Finnish, Polish, Bessarabian, Crimean and Georgian provinces. Mr. Wolff adds the comment: "Apart from his total misunderstanding of the Prussian character, he does not seem to have realised that reunited nationalities, just as much as emancipated democracies, may be quite as dangerous to the general peace as the most ambitious and unscrupulous of despotisms. National character does not change with widening frontiers or even expanding forms of government" (p. 84).

Stern, Alfred: L'Insurrection polonaise de 1863 et l'Impératrice Eugénie. (*Revue Historique*, May-June, 1921.) Letters concerning a Franco-Austrian Alliance, with a reunited Poland under a Habsburg and the cession of Venice to Italy, Austria being compensated by territory along the Adriatic coast.

Elliott, Sir Henry (G.C.B.): Some Revolutions and other Diplomatic Experiences. (Edited by the author's daughter.) (Murray), 1922. In the introduction it is stated, and it is confirmed in the text, that the British Consul-General at Constantinople in 1876, Sir Philip Francis, retained a dispatch sent from Adrianople by the Vice-Consul Dupuis, reporting on the excesses committed by the Turkish irregular troops at Adrianople, and showed it to (Sir) Edwin Pears, the correspondent of the *Daily News*. Thus the document which gave the incentive to the "Bulgarian atrocities" campaign did not reach the British Embassy. For many years Sir Henry Elliott was held responsible for not having informed the Foreign Office of these events. The Chapters on "The Bulgarian Atrocities" and the "Conference of Constantinople" are of very considerable interest.

Stone, Melville (Counsellor of the Associated Press): Fifty Years as a Journalist. (Heinemann), 1922. Gives an interesting account of the removal of the Russian censorship on foreign news (pp. 261-277) obtained in January, 1904, at first for the Associated Press, and later for all foreign newspaper correspondents, by the author, who negotiated with the Foreign Minister, Count Lammsdorff, and the Minister of the Interior Plehve, and was received by the Emperor.

Headlam-Morley, J. W.: Russian Diplomacy before the War. (*Quarterly Review*, January, 1922. An examination of the origin and contents of three books: *Diplomatische Aktenstücke zur Gesch. der Ententepolitik der Vorkriegsjahre*, edited by B. v. Siebert, former secretary to the Russian Embassy in London (Berlin, 1921); *Aus den Geheimarchiven des Zaren*, by M. Pokrovski, the Bolshevik school commissar (Berlin, 1919), and *Kriegsursachen*, by M. Boghitchewitsch (Bogičević), former Serbian Chargé d'Affaires in Berlin (Zürich, 1919). Some of the author's conclusions and impressions deserve quoting. With regard to the conversations between Sir Charles Hardinge and Isvolsky at Reval in June, 1908, he writes: "While the German Government were in possession of the true facts, they allowed incorrect statements to be put about by men such as Count Rentlow." Russia's Serbian policy "does not appear to justify" the charge of "constant intrigues to stir up the Balkan states to provocative policy." The activities of Hartwig, the Russian minister in Belgrade, inspire the following remark: "Russia is not the only country in the world which has from time to time been incommoded by the excessive zeal of subordinate officials." "The only conclusion we can draw" from the disclosures from Anti-Entente sources "is that those in authority in Russia were on the whole working in a spirit of loyalty both to France and England." "It is impossible indeed in reading the correspondence, not to recognise that there was a very serious danger arising out of the complex system of alliances; and the Powers were always considering what their position would be, supposing Austria attacked Serbia." This same point was urged very strongly in a memorandum submitted to the Tsar by the late Baron Rosen, Russian ambassador at Washington, which reached publicity in an incomplete form.

Regarding Siebert, it may be mentioned that at the outbreak of war he resigned his post as second secretary at the Russian Embassy, owing to his alien origin, and was employed by Baring Brothers, but soon retired into private life. The dispatches of the Ambassador, Count Benckendorff, were accessible to him, and well-informed quarters suppose that he took copies of all the documents now published by him in Germany. The theory that dispatches were intercepted in Berlin obviously applies only to telegrams forwarded by that route.

Chronology of the War. Edited by Lord Edward Gleichen, for the Ministry of Information. 3 vols. and atlas (Constable), 1918-20. This

has been compiled from the most reliable authorities in English, French and German, but its main basis has been *The Times*, corrected, checked and amplified.

Dillon, E. J. : Two Russian Statesmen. (*Quarterly Review*, October, 1921.) A review of the Memoirs of Witte, Izvolsky and Neklyudov. "Witte's book is a collection of desultory notes and comments penned spasmodically in his various moods. . . . Much that ought never to have seen the light has here been published *in extenso*; while accounts of certain momentous events . . . have been either suppressed or mislaid. The style is amorphous, and at times the grammar is bad." "The memoirs are disfigured by many concrete errors"—e.g., the conference following Agadir did not originate from Witte's initiative, as he maintains. There follow character sketches of Witte and Izvolsky, with some valuable reminiscences about both statesmen.

Poincaré, Raymond : The Origins of the War. (Cassell), 1922. 255 pp. Contains important references to the origin of the Russian Alliance, formally adopted on 15/27 December 1893—4 January 1894, by an exchange of letters between MM. de Giers and de Montebello. Owing to the Tsar's insistence, this convention had to be kept strictly secret, and its text did not appear in any Yellow Book till 1918. It was prolonged in August, 1899, and a naval convention was added on 16 July, 1912.

Wilton, Robert : The Rush for Siberia : Causes of the Present Crisis in the Pacific. (*Fortnightly Review*, November, 1921.) Gives detailed personal experiences, and suggestions made by him in December, 1917, to the Allies, such as might, in his view, have saved Siberia from Bolshevik rule, if Japan's conduct had not caused a postponement fatal to Russia and the Allies, and increasing the menace of the "Yellow Peril."

Dehn, Madame Lili (described on title page as "close friend of the late Empress of Russia") : The Real Tsaritsa. (Thornton Butterworth), 1922. 253 pp. Not faultless in judgment, but contains first-hand information of its kind.

Brummer, General Constantin : Les derniers Jours du Grand Duc Nicholas Mikhailovitch. (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 Nov. 1921.) An account of events from the order to leave Petrograd (30 March, 1918) up to the execution of the four Grand Dukes, Nicholas (well known as historian and naturalist) and George Mikhailovich, Dmitri Constantinovich and Paul Alexandrovich, on 28-29 January, 1919, at the Peter and Paul fortress.

Beckhofer, C. E. : Through Starving Russia (being a Record of a Journey to Moscow and the Volga provinces in August and September, 1921). (Methuen), 1921. 165 pp. "I think I may claim to be the first who has described the instantaneous results of the new policy (*i.e.*, the admission of private trading) upon the life and psychology of the Russian people." There is an interview with Chicherin, who received him well owing to his book on Denikin.

NOTES.

Slavonic Studies in Germany.

THE first four articles of No. 1 of this review should serve to remind English readers of the extent to which Slavonic problems have been ignored or neglected in Britain till very recently. Every day there are conventional references in the press to the danger of

German penetration in Russia: yet there is only one way to counteract that danger, and that is by increasing our own knowledge of, and interest in, Russia and the Slavs generally. If the Germans should end by securing a predominant position in Russia, it will be the result of superior application and harder work.

No more enlightening commentary upon the future prospects of British and German workers in Russia can be found than the following list of courses on East European subjects at the Universities of Germany during the summer of 1921, and we make no apology for reproducing it in full:—

Berlin.—Ballod—Soviet Russia's Economic Situation. Hoetzsch—Russian History, 1796–1855. Stählin—Russian Intellectual History in XIX. century; History of Poland. Brinkman—The Polish Constitution of 1795. Pohle—Russian Ethnography. Brückner—History of Russian Literature; Polish Literature. Lane—Russian Language; Old Bulgarian. Bahnik—Polish Language. Grugger—Hungarian Grammar. Farkas—Idem; The Hungarian Reformation in Poetry.

Bonn.—Goetz—Russia's Historical and Intellectual Development.

Breslau.—Freytagh-Loringhoven—Legislation of Russian Revolution; Constitutional Law under Tsardom. Laubert—Polish History. Andreae—Balkan History. Diels—Old Church Slavonic Grammar; Slav Antiquities; Czech Language. Hanisch—Serbo-Croat; Polish Literature; Russian Epics. Grünenthal—Russian Theatre; Russian and Polish Language; Lithuanian. (Osteuropa-Institut) Reier—Polish Civil and Commercial Law. Nebel—German-Roumanian Trade Relations. Fückner—New Russian Economic Policy; Polish Economics and Finance. Scholl—Russian Raw Materials. Dietrich—East European Capitals. Berkner—Population and Land in Poland. Haase—Present Day Cultural Problems in Poland. Hanisch—National, Social and Literary Currents among the Poles. Grotte—Art in Prague.

Frankfurt.—Fritzler—Russian Language. Gerland—Bulgarian History.

Freiburg.—Dunitrevsky—Russian Language.

Giessen.—Hirt—Old Bulgarian Grammar. Karstien—Russian Language.

Göttingen.—Hermann—Russian Grammar. Grünen—Russian Language.

Greifswald.—Brüske—Russian Language. Rosenquist—The Kalevala. Paul—Baltic History.

Halle.—Lezius—Russian Literature; Language. Bartolomäus—Polish Grammar; Pan Tadeusz.

Hamburg.—Salomon—Recent Russian History; Russian Readings. Byhan—Old Bulgarian. von Kleinenberg—Russian Language. von Reybekiel—Polish language.

Heidelberg.—von Bubnov—Russian Poets and Thinkers; Language

Kiel.—Jensen—Hungarian Language. Fraenkel—Old Prussian Literary Memorials; Old Polish Texts. Keller—Russian Language.

Köln.—Feilgenhauer—Russian Language.

Königsberg.—Rust—Old Slavonic Grammar; Old Polish; Russian Literature. Trautmann—Russian and Czech Exercises; Lithuanian Grammar. Arsenev—Russian Readings. Seraphim—East European History. Preyer—Russian Agrarian History. Friederichsen.—East European Boundaries. Uckeley—Russian Religious Life.

Leipzig.—Vosmer—The Slavs, Origin and Expansion; Early Slav Grammatical Forms; Serbo-Croat Grammar; Old Russian Chronicles. Gerullis—Old Prussian Grammar; Lithuanian. Meyer—Historical Grammar of Wend Language; Church Slavonic Texts; Russian Readings. Weigand—Modern Bulgarian Grammar; Bulgarian Literature; Banat Place-names. Schwarz—Hungarian Language.

Marburg.—Jacobsohn—Russian and Polish Language.

Munich.—Berneker—Slav Popular Poetry; the Slav Verb; Pushkin. von Güldenstübbe—Russian Language; Russian Ethnography.

Münster.—Klostermann—Russian. Kayser—Polish.

(For the above we are indebted to the *Prager Presse* of 29 April 1922.)

The Study of English in Jugoslavia.

Last winter the newly founded Slovene University of Ljubljana, appointed as its first lecturer in English one of the members of our School, Mrs. F. S. Copeland, who is known by her admirable translations of Serbo-Croat dramatic literature. One of the first fruits of her activity has been the formation of a Yugoslav Society for the study of English. Its Chairman is Dr. Gustav Gregorin, before the war a leading Slovene deputy in the Austrian Parliament, and during the war a member of the Yugoslav Committee in London; its Vice-Chairman is Dr. Fran Skaberné, Director of the Department of Education in Slovenia. At its inaugural meeting last March a young Dalmatian poet, Mr. Ljuba Jurković, recited a striking version of the Scottish ballad *The Wife of Usher's Well*, which we are only prevented by reasons of space from reproducing here. There is now a steady stream of English translations of Yugoslav ballad poetry: we hope that many of our own ballads will now be translated in their turn.

The Ljubljana society is forming an English library, to be housed at the University: perhaps some of our readers may care to help it on to its feet by presents of standard English books. I should greatly welcome communications on this subject. R. W. S. W.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON, KING'S COLLEGE.

SCHOOL OF SLAVONIC STUDIES.

COURSES OF STUDY.

Bachelor of Arts, Honours.—Russian, Polish, Czechoslovak, Yugoslav. In each of these subjects the student can take *either* philology and literature *or* history and economics. In each case, either of the two subjects named can be taken as a special study, and the other as subsidiary. The following extra subsidiary subjects are required: for philology, another European language, preferably German; for literature, another European literature; for history, modern European history from Peter the Great; for economics, modern economic history and organisation from 1800.

Bachelor of Arts, Pass.—Russian, Polish, Czechoslovak, Yugoslav. In each of these groups the subjects are as follows: translation and composition; history including laws and institutions, together with political geography; *either* literature, *or* economics with economic geography.

Bachelor of Commerce (at the London School of Economics).—The student may specialise in his final year of study in the economic conditions of Russia.

Diploma.—Russian, Polish, Czechoslovak, Yugoslav. In each of these groups the subjects are as follows: translation and composition; history including laws and institutions, together with political geography; literature, more particularly as one of the principal expressions of social history; economics with economic geography. The Diploma need not involve Matriculation and does not confer a University Degree.

Certificates.—There is a University Certificate in Russian. A College Certificate in Russian is also obtainable after an intensive course of five months or more in the language.

Journalism.—Students can take Russian as one of the subjects qualifying for the University Diploma in Journalism.

CONFERENCES OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS OF RUSSIAN AND OTHER SLAVONIC LANGUAGES.

Chairman of Conference - - - Professor N. FORBES (Oxford).

Secretary of Conference - - - A. RAFFI (London).

Chairman of Standing Committee - Professor Sir B. PARES (London).

Chairman of Philological Committee Professor N. FORBES.

Committee for Questions on Books - Mr. L. WHARTON, Baron A. F.
MEYENDORFF, Prince D. S.
MIRSKY.

TRANSLITERATION OF RUSSIAN.

а — a	л — l	ч — ch
б — b	м — m	ш — sh
в — v	н — n	щ — shch
г — g (h)	о — o	ъ — omit
д — d	п — p	ы — i
е — e	р — r	ь — '
ё — ë	с — s	ѣ — e
ж — zh	т — t	э — e
з — z	у — u	ю — yu
и } — i	ф — f	я — ya
й } — y	х — kh	ѳ — t
к — k	ц — ts	в — i

Note.—In this Review the principles recommended by the Conference are generally followed, subject to a few variations in detail.

OTHER SLAVONIC ORTHOGRAPHIES.

Polish.	Czech Slovak.	Serbo-Croat Slovene.	
c	c	c	= ts in "cats."
cz	č	č	= ch in "church."
ć	—	ć	= (a sound between č and tj).
ch	ch	h	= h in "hard."
sz	š	š	= sh in "ship."
ž	ž	ž	= j in French "jour."
dž	—	d, gj	= J in "Jew."
—	d'	dj	= d in "due."
ie	ě	je	= y in "yet."
l	l'	lj	= l in "collusion."
ń	ň	nj	= n in "new."
—	t'	tj	= t in "tune."
rz	ř	—	= rzh.
ł	—	—	= sound approximating to w.
w	v	v	= v in "view."

For Bulgarian the same diacritic signs are used as for Serbo-Croat.

German, Hungarian and Roumanian are transcribed each according to its own orthography.

RUSSIAN WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

1 Verst	-	-	-	=	0.66 miles.
1 Sazhen	-	-	-	=	2.33 yards.
1 Arshin	-	-	-	=	0.77 yards.
1 Square Verst	-	-	-	=	281.22 acres.
1 Desyatina	-	-	-	=	2.69 acres.
1 Vedro	-	-	-	=	2.70 gallons.
1 Chetvert	-	-	-	=	5.77 Imperial bushels.
1 Pud	-	-	-	=	0.32 cwt.
1 Funt	-	-	-	=	0.90 lb. (Avoir du pois.)

(These calculations we owe to the courtesy of the London Chamber of Commerce, Russian Section).

TEACHERS OF RUSSIAN AND OTHER SLAVONIC LANGUAGES IN GREAT BRITAIN.

We propose, at a later date, to print a map of Great Britain showing at which places teaching in these languages can be obtained; and we shall be glad to receive the names and addresses of any such teachers, whether in London or the provinces, of which a register will be kept for the purpose of answering any inquiries which may be addressed to us.

ERRATA.

- Page 361, line 25. *For* Gondharov *read* Goncharov.
 Page 362, cursim. *For* Národný *read* Národní.
 Page 363, line 27. *For* Krička *read* Křička.
 Page 364, line 2 from foot. *For* Křižkovsky *read* Křížkovský.
 Page 370, last line. *For* Čarovouci *read* Čaroskvouci.
 Page 428, line 3 of footnote. *For* 1914 *read* 1904.
 Page 442, lines 19 and 20 of the poem should be transposed.
 Page 482, line 12. *For* Balkan ballads *read* Balkan standards.
 Page 484, line 1. *For* ožech *read* ořech.
 Page 487, line 7. *For* nisam bil *read* nisem bil.

Two very regrettable blunders were allowed to creep into the biographical note on "Contributors to No. 2." Mr. Skirmunt was formerly Minister to the Quirinal, not to the Vatican; and Professor Novák is well known as an essayist, not as a novelist.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE SCHOOL.

I.

The Historian as a Political Force in Central Europe

(being the Inaugural Lecture delivered on 2 November, 1922, by R. W. Seton-Watson, as Professor of Central European History in the University of London).

Price 2s. net.

2.

To be published in May.

The Distribution and Inter-relations of the Slavonic Peoples and Languages.

(Inaugural Lecture by N. B. Jopson, Reader in Comparative Slavonic Philology in the University of London).

Price 2s. net.

CONTRIBUTORS TO No. 3.

PAUL NOVGORODTSEV, formerly Professor of Jurisprudence at Moscow University, afterwards Director of the Moscow Commercial Institute, is now head of the Russian Faculty of Law at Prague University. He is the author of several well-known legal works, and was specially active in the reform of the Russian Church in 1917.

ALEXANDER KIESEWETTER, one of Klyuchevsky's best pupils, was Professor of History at Moscow University, and a member of the Second Duma (Liberal). He was one of the last intellectuals to be expelled from Russia.

VATROSLAV JAGIĆ was Professor of Slavonics first at St. Petersburg, then at Vienna University, and the most eminent Western Slavist since his teacher Miklosich. He founded and edited for 35 years the international *Archiv für slavische Philologie*.

MRS. BLAKEY is the wife of a former British Consul at Kharkov.

R. W. SETON-WATSON is Professor of Central European History in the University of London, joint editor of this review, and author of various books on Austro-Hungarian and Balkan history.

MICHAEL GAVRILOVIĆ is Minister of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes in London, and a distinguished Serbian historian and archivist; author of the standard life of Miloš Obrenović and other historical works.

LADY GROGAN worked for the Macedonian Relief Fund during the insurrection of 1903, and during the war supervised the entire staff organisation of the Serbian Relief Fund. Her article on Modern Bulgaria in the new volumes of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* is to be followed shortly by a book on Bulgarian history.

J. H. PENSON has travelled in Russia, the Baltic countries and Poland, and made a special study of social and administrative conditions in the latter country.

THADDAEUS ZIELIŃSKI was for many years Professor of Classics at Petrograd University, and is well known throughout Europe as a classical scholar. His best-known books are *Our Debt to Antiquity* (1909 in English), *The Religion of the Ancients* and *The Influence of Homer and Pindar on Mickiewicz*. He now holds the Chair of Classics at Warsaw University.

SERGIUS BULGAKOV was for many years Professor of Economics in Kiev and Moscow, and is a foremost authority on Russian religious questions. He took holy orders during the Revolution and ranks high as an Orthodox theologian.

OLIVER ELTON is Professor of English Literature at Liverpool (formerly at Manchester) University. He is the author of *Modern Studies*, *A Survey of English Literature*, a life of Professor York Powell, and other works.

FRANTIŠEK CHUDOBA, now Professor of English at Brno (Brünn) University, was from 1920 to 1922 the first lecturer in Czecho-Slovak at King's College.

OTOKAR VOČADLO is his successor in the same post.

SIR VALENTINE CHIROL, formerly Foreign Editor of the *Times*, is a well-known authority on India and the Far East. His two most notable books are *Indian Unrest* and *The Egyptian Problem*.

THE SLAVONIC REVIEW.

VOL. I. No. 3.

MARCH 1923.

ON SLAVONIC RECIPROCITY.

IN these days, when the world presents a spectacle of the most complicated and confused situations, when distress and hatred divide peoples into hostile camps, it is with a feeling of peculiar satisfaction that one dwells on relations which are founded upon other principles, bearing witness that sympathy and reciprocity have not vanished from the world. Among such consoling phenomena of present-day life is the fact of Slavonic reciprocity, which is shown plainly and eloquently by the lot of the Russians, at this hour so full of tragedy for their country. The ideas and feelings which have produced Slavonic reciprocity are of very long standing. Among the Southern and Western Slavs—the Serbs, Bulgars and Czechs—who have never fought against Russians and are conscious of their blood-relationship with them, there has long been a real affection for Russia. In her they see not only a natural support for their own aspirations to independence, but also an encouraging example of the political power which could be achieved by a Slavonic people. On the other side, Russians have long felt for their brother Slavs a sincere, almost mystical affection, and a strong sense of duty towards them. If, as Dostoyevsky says, the Russian people in its more modern history has several times shown a desire to serve humanity, this was expressed most clearly in the support which it rendered to the other Slavs. The Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78, and the recent war with Austria and Germany, show that this support was not a mere platonic feeling, and that for Russia Slavonic reciprocity is not an abstract dream, but a living reality, which has been sealed with blood.

In the West, there was a widely-held view identifying Slavonic

reciprocity with militant Pan-Slavism. In Austria and Germany, in particular, it was often suggested that these ideas, as expounded in Russia, were aimed against Europe, and it cannot be denied that there were individual Russian writers of whom this is perfectly true. It is enough to mention Danilevsky and his work "Russia and Europe." But these views never penetrated the mass of the Russian public and never became the ruling principles of Russian policy, and, indeed, the writings of Danilevsky in particular called forth at the time vigorous protests from such outstanding Russian thinkers as Dostoyevsky, K. Leontiev and Vladimir Solovyev. From various points of view they rejected his militant Slavism and opposed to it the idea of the mission of Russia, as a country imbued with the principles of Christianity.

It is surely obvious that, after the tragedy through which Russia has been passing, the revival of Pan-Slavism in whatever form would be an absurdity. But there is every reason for speaking of the vitality and essential need of Slavonic reciprocity. There can be no doubt that the Slavonic peoples are now coming out on the stage of history, and that Russia, whom her enemies have so lately buried, is not far from her regeneration. And it is certain that both the other Slavonic peoples which have risen again to new life, and the Russian people itself, are now eagerly taking their special place in world-civilisation by the side of the peoples of Western Europe, both for their own good and for that of all humanity. But in order to make this place permanent, they must realise their own principles of civilisation, their own cultural mission. At a time when European civilisation is passing through a grievous crisis, they must pour their own fresh sap into the common store of spiritual life.

That is why it is so significant and important that at this critical moment, by the order of destiny, many Russians are brought into the closest ties with the Southern and Western Slavs, in Jugoslavia and Czechoslovakia. The Serbs were the first to offer their hospitality to exiled Russians, and a little later the Czechoslovaks came to their rescue with the same large generosity. Both these sister countries not only welcomed and housed the Russians, they helped in the education of young folk and children, stood behind those who could make arrangements for themselves, supported those who could not find work, and enabled many to return to their former vocations.

As to Serbia, by the official statistics of the Government Commission which has been specially engaged in making

arrangements for Russians, by the beginning of 1923 there had been registered 28,203 refugees. The Government Commission gave them help of various kinds, it made allowances for supporting three Cadet Corps with 225 pupils, three women's institutes with 710, and one mixed Russian-Serbian gymnasium in Belgrade with 160, of whom 120 are boarders. Besides this the Commission helps the All Russian Union of Towns to support organised educational institutions of various kinds, with a total of 750 pupils. In Serbia, there are no higher classes for Russians, and, therefore, the Commission supports men and women students by giving them bourses of 400 dinars a month, of which, at the present time, there are 1,200. Moreover, it has decided to allow 120,000 dinars a month to improve the conditions of students, this sum to be distributed by the Council of Students' Affairs. Lastly, in view of the extremely unfavourable housing conditions in Belgrade, the Government Commission, in conjunction with the Zemstvo Union, has granted the necessary means to build hostels for 150 Russian students. The work of building was finished by the beginning of the present year. As a further consequence of these housing difficulties, the Commission has rented a house for Russian refugees, and has assigned grants for courses of various kinds, a hospital, houses for disabled soldiers, out-patients' departments, and almshouses for the aged. It has also placed a certain number of Russians in various health resorts.

In 1922 the Government Commission examined applications from 679 different groups for help to Russian refugees, while the number of individual applications for help was 22,799.¹

It will be seen from these data how various has been the help extended in Jugoslavia to Russian refugees. The Government Commission helps some to support themselves, others to obtain education, others, again, to survive the distress which has unexpectedly fallen upon them in these grievous years. How many it is saving from ruin ! How many it is helping to rescue !

No less remarkable and varied in its scope and, in some respects, even more organised and considerable, is the help which has been given to Russians in Czechoslovakia.

To Jugoslavia the first wave of Russian refugees flowed in as early as the spring of 1919, when the Bolsheviks occupied Odessa and Crimea, after they were left by the French. The second wave, a much larger one, came in the first month of 1920, after the

¹ All these figures are taken from the official report of the Commission, printed in *Rul*, 6 February, 1923.

second occupation of Odessa and Novorossiysk by the Bolsheviks. From that time onwards more and more new groups continued to arrive, attracted to Serbia in the hope of finding shelter in a brotherly country. In Czechoslovakia, the first considerable groups of Russian refugees appeared only in the autumn of 1921, and they came here in connection with a definite plan of the Czechoslovak Government, which has set itself the object of saving the educated class for the future Russia, by enabling young people to finish their education, and helping scholars, writers and artists to go on with their work. When, in the summer of 1921, an inquiry was addressed to Prague from Constantinople—then crowded with refugee students—as to whether it would be possible to give shelter to at least some of them in Czechoslovakia, a very prompt decision was reached here. The energetic Professor Lomshakov, formerly of Petrograd, who was at that time living in Prague, appealed to the Czechoslovak Government and general public, and met with the fullest sympathy. Thus, as early as the autumn of 1921, there appeared in Prague the first groups of Russian students, who not so long before were stranded in Constantinople in conditions not far removed from starvation, without any hope of finishing their education. Here they are supplied with clothes, linen and boots, receive free quarters and educational materials, and can enter higher schools for the most various studies. After the first groups came more and more, and now, instead of a thousand Russian students as proposed at the start, more than 2,600 are studying in Czechoslovakia, of whom each, besides clothes, etc., receives about 800 Czech crowns a month. Apart from some groups of students who were brought from Constantinople, other groups are now beginning to arrive here from Africa, Vladivostok and Bulgaria, with permission of the Government. Sometimes there even come on foot individual students from the most distant parts, attracted to Prague by the fame of Czech hospitality, which is circulated far and wide. But it is not only students who have found shelter here; even before the first group arrived from Constantinople, a number of Russian professors were invited to Prague from Turkey and other countries, and were here offered the support required for their maintenance and for the continuance of their work. Nor were the younger scholars preparing for professorships, forgotten. At first it was proposed to invite in all 50 professors, teachers and young scholars. Now, in the course of a year and a half, more than 90 are to be found in Czechoslovakia. Latterly, the number has

been increased by many distinguished scholars, who have lately been expelled from Russia.

This abundant supply of scholars in the most various departments of knowledge has made possible the organisation in Prague of a whole number of Russian educational institutions. Already open and at work here, we have a Russian Faculty of Law, a Russian Institute designed for the study of Russia in all its aspects, and courses of radiotelegraphy in the Polytechnical Institute. A Pedagogical Institute, and a People's University (University Extension Courses) remodelled out of already existing organisations for public lectures, will also be opened very shortly.

But it is not only higher education in Czech and partly in Russian Higher Schools, as, for instance, the Russian Faculty of Law, that is secured for Russians in the Czechoslovak Republic. There are also two Russian Gymnasias (secondary classical schools) in which the entire teaching, except instruction in the Czech language, is conducted in Russian and by Russian instructors. The first of these Gymnasias is near Třebova, a small town in Moravia. Here there are 525 pupils, 17 teachers and 10 tutors. Besides a Gymnasium, there are a Russian church, a number of lodgings for the staff, a general store, a depôt of educational materials, a chemical laboratory, a library, a hospital and out-patients' department, a dental cabinet, a concert hall, a theatre, a laundry and a kitchen—in a word, it is a full-fledged Russian colony. This Gymnasium was at first brought in December, 1921, from Constantinople, where it had been founded by the All-Russian Union of Towns. Now it is maintained by the Czechoslovak Government. Another Russian Gymnasium was opened in the autumn of 1922 in Prague, on the type of the remodelled Czech Modern Schools (*Realschulen*). There are now in this school 120 pupils and 7 regular instructors; 45 of them are boarders. The pupils who attend are given dinner and tea, and are lent books and other educational materials. Those in need also receive clothes, linen and boots.

Besides this, various special schools have been opened in Prague for Russians. We may mention (1) the Russian Institute of Co-operation, with a two years' course, which has five regular instructors and 112 pupils, maintained by the Czechoslovak Government; (2) the Railway School, with a two years' course, numbering six instructors, and 40 scholars, who receive 600 crowns a month; (3) courses of commerce and bookkeeping, with four instructors and 50 pupils, each of whom also receives 400

crowns a month; (4) a Motor and Tractor School, with two sections—a six months' course for chauffeurs and a ten months' course for mechanics. In the first section there are 70 scholars, in the second 30, each receiving 600 crowns a month.

As in Serbia, so also in Czechoslovakia, apart from the help given to Russians for education, there are various other forms of assistance which have been organised in Prague, chiefly through the so-called "Zemgor," or Union of Workers of the Russian County and Town Councils, which was formed during the war to supply various needs of the army, and is now continuing its work abroad. The Prague section of "Zemgor" is at present, with the help of means received chiefly from the Czechoslovak Government, attending to various needs of education, of medical assistance, and of finding work for persons unemployed. "Zemgor" has organised a labour bureau, medical help, an out-patients' department, and the distribution of free materials, clothing, boots and linen. It also controls some of the educational institutions already named; for instance, the Prague Gymnasium, the Railway School, the Motor and Tractor courses, public educational readings, etc. It has organised courses of foreign languages and possesses an excellent Russian library of 9,000 volumes. It supports a Russian theatre in Prague.

Assistance is also given by the Czechoslovak Government to a Committee of Russian Writers and Journalists, which receives 26 bourses of 800 to 1,600 crowns a month, for advancing money to writers; and also to a Union of Engineers and Technicians, with seven bourses of 1,000 crowns, for those who wish to continue their professional work and to study the industry of Czechoslovakia. Help is also given to an Agricultural Union which finds work for peasants and workers, issues an agricultural paper of its own under the name of *Khutor* (*The Farm*), conducts a six months' course for Russian landworkers, and publishes agricultural pamphlets in Russian and in Czech. About 4,000 landworkers, mostly Cossacks, have been registered and found employment by this Union. The Cossacks also have in Prague their own United Cossack Committee with a labour bureau. The Cossacks of the Kuban have a society of their own.

Lastly, there are special organisations to assist the Ukrainians, Georgians and other national groups which are, in one way or another, connected with Russia. All these are also subsidised by the Government of the Czechoslovak Republic. These subsidies are sometimes very considerable; for instance, the Ukrainian students alone number 1,500, with 24 professors and lecturers.

All this help is almost exclusively concentrated in the Russian Section of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, under the direct control of Dr. Girsas.¹

The data which I have given might be supplemented still further; but they give a picture of the assistance which Czechoslovakia is rendering to Russian refugees. Only a real love for Russia and a firm belief in her brighter future could have built up this magnificent organisation of help, and only the exceptionally wise general and financial policy of the Government and Parliament of the Czechoslovak Republic could have found the means to carry it into effect.

For us Russians who live here, an enormous importance attaches to the material help which we receive from our blood-brothers; but still greater is the importance of that moral atmosphere of real affection and friendly care which surrounds us here. True friends are known in misfortune, and the friendship of Slavs has proved to be of the kind that cannot be broken by any trials. In the friendly Slavonic countries, Russians know that they are regarded as the sons of a great people which has not only a great past but also a great future and we cannot doubt that there is also a great future for that Slavonic reciprocity, of which this narrative is so remarkable an illustration.

Prague, March, 1923.

PAUL NOVGORODTSEV.

¹ Dr. Girsas was the peculiarly able representative of Czechoslovakia in Vladivostok in 1919, during the *régime* of Admiral Kolchak, where he rendered great services to the Allied cause.

KLYUCHEVSKY AND HIS *COURSE OF RUSSIAN HISTORY*.

THE name of Klyuchevsky, Professor of History in Moscow, is famous both in the learned world of Russia and in the Russian reading public. His celebrated *Course of Russian History* was an event of the first importance, both in the development of Russian scientific historical study and in the story of Russian civilisation, because the rare union in this course of scientific with literary merits aroused interest far beyond the limits of any narrow circle of specialists. We may say, without any exaggeration, that this course is the most eagerly studied of all works of scientific learning in Russia.

Klyuchevsky began his work as a teacher in Moscow University at the very end of the XIXth century, on the death of his teacher and predecessor, Solovyev. His very first appearance aroused genuine enthusiasm among his pupils, who were at once captivated both by the depth of his erudition and by the unusual brilliancy of the artistic form in which the lecturer clothed his ideas. From that time his reputation rose steadily, according as the students who passed through his Course carried all over the country their enthusiastic accounts of his teaching. It was only towards the end of his life that Klyuchevsky began to prepare this Course for the press. The four volumes published before his death cover a period from the beginning of Russian history to the accession of Catherine II. Their success with the reading public was enormous. They were bought up at once, and more and more new editions were quickly required. Klyuchevsky became the most popular and authoritative national historian. He died in 1913, before he could complete the fifth and last volume of his Course, which was to include the reign of Catherine II. and the whole of the XIXth century. Last winter this final volume at last appeared, prepared for the press by his pupil, Y. L. Barskov. The most remarkable work on Russian history thus becomes accessible in its complete form to the reading public. This serves us as an occasion to sketch, in the pages of the SLAVONIC REVIEW, the significance of Klyuchevsky's work in the story of Russia's learning and culture

The first attempts at a general survey of all Russian history were made during the XVIIIth century. Among them the most important were two works, one by Tatishchev in the first half of that century, and the other by Shcherbatov in the second half. Both these works were cumbrous and unreadable re-hashes of the Russian chronicles. In them there was no suggestion of a scientific conception of Russian history. They could not help to arouse interest in the subject in the public, as the clumsiness of the narrative completely scared the reader away from these bulky volumes.

At the beginning of the XIXth century, in the reign of Alexander I., a first-class writer of the period, N. M. Karamzin, set to work on a Russian History. With the help of some persons who were at the head of the historical archives, Karamzin succeeded in collecting an enormous amount of historical material, chronicles, records and documents of all kinds, and, making use of these materials and also largely relying on the above-named works of his predecessors, he wrote his *History of the Russian State* up to the beginning of the Time of Troubles—that is, to the XVIIth century.

This was an epoch-making work in the study of Russian history. The author invested his historical narrative with an admirable literary style and contrived to communicate an attractive charm to the dullest episodes. His history was read like a poem or a novel. The public was enraptured with the eloquence of this work; but those who were more profoundly acquainted with the subject even then noticed essential defects in the "History" of Karamzin. One of these was the absence of historical perspective. The conception of a historical evolution was entirely foreign to Karamzin; and the Kiev principality of the Xth and XIth centuries seemed to him just as well-ordered a State as the Russian Empire at the beginning of the XIXth century. Another defect was a certain narrowness of view. It has often been said that Karamzin only wrote the history of the State and did not touch that of the internal life of the people. But, as a matter of fact, the field of his historical vision was even narrower. His work is not even the history of the State. It is no more than a history of sovereigns. It is an eloquent narrative of good or evil princes, of their good and evil deeds, with the moralist's comments on each. The usual explanation of this feature of Karamzin's work is that he was not a historian at all, and had no definite views on the nature of the process of history. He was only a man of letters, an eloquent narrator. This

explanation is hardly correct. At the bottom of his historical narrative it is not difficult to discover a definite set of ideas, which he drew from the rationalist philosophy of the XVIIIth century. Of course, the idea that the course of public life depends entirely on the will of the monarch lay at the bottom of the system of enlightened absolutism which was so closely connected with the rationalism of the XVIIIth century, and, regarding the history of the country as the history of its sovereigns, Karamzin only followed obediently the prevailing conception of the time, of which, by the circumstances of his education, he was the spiritual product.

In the Twenties and Thirties of the XIXth century, Karamzin was the predominant authority in Russian historical study. But from the end of the Forties other intellectual tendencies obtained the leading influence on Russian historical thought. The intellectual stage is filled by a generation educated in the philosophical systems of Hegel and Schelling. The leaders of this generation were divided into two camps, Westernisers and Slavophiles. The conflict between these two views absorbed the intellectual life of Russia during the Forties. Thus the tendencies of Russian historical thought came to be intimately connected with this conflict of ideas. Both Westernisers and Slavophiles, following their German authorities, regarded the process of history as a logical disclosure of the universal reason in the successive appearance of historic peoples on the scene of world-history. This created entirely new tasks for historical study. It was not the picturing of the individual achievements of different heroes of history that was the centre of historical interests. The historian's attention was fixed on the discovery of the fundamental principles of national life and the study of those forms of State order in which these principles were expressed as they developed. Here the Westernisers saw the highest stage of the discovery of the universal reason in the forms of State in Western Europe, and therefore saw the actual task of Russia in the assimilation by the Russian people of these principles. When, therefore, they studied the story of Russia's past they were chiefly interested in the evolution of forms of State, the evolution of government, the gradual subordination of primitive and elemental relations to the civilising action of an ordered system of juridical institutions. Thus, from the pen of the chief representatives of the Westernising school there appeared a number of distinguished monographs on the history of government and state institutions in Russia. Solovyev, Chicherin, Kavelin, Dmitriev were the outstanding

names of this group of historians, who were called the Juridical School. The interest of Slavophil historians took another direction. They started from the idea that Slavonic and Russian civilisation rests on principles entirely opposed to those of civilisation in Western Europe. And in these quite peculiar principles of Russian culture they found the highest revelation of the universal reason. In the borrowing of Western European forms of state-order they saw a forcible act of the Government, and regarded it as a fatal mistake, which retarded the free development of the vital principles of Russian life. In their historical studies they concentrated their attention, not on the foreign forms of state, which, in their opinion, had been imposed upon Russia from outside, but on the study of the inner content of national life, of national beliefs, of national creation, of national customs and of national economics. These studies produced another series of monographs parallel to those mentioned above. Aksakov, Belayev, Afanasyev, Zabelin, Valuyev are the principal representatives of this tendency of Russian historical study.

Thus the Forties and Fifties of the XIXth century were a time of monographs investigating different sides of Russian historical life, and, taken all together, these monographs widened the field of the study of Russian history far beyond the limits of the picturesque narrative of Karamzin. Karamzin's work became finally and definitely obsolete, and now retained only the interest of historical literature. There arose the need for a new general work on the history of Russia which would unite the results of the investigations of the monographs and give a general picture of the history of Russia from the point of view of the new demands of historical science.

This task was from the middle of the Fifties attempted by the Moscow Professor, Solovyev. He gave to it twenty years of work. From the middle of the Fifties to the end of the Seventies there appeared regularly every year a new volume of his really monumental *History of Russia* from the most ancient times. In all, there were twenty-nine volumes. The author took his narrative from the beginning of Russian history to the middle of the reign of Catherine II., and only his death prevented him from carrying further this magnificent work. The history of Solovyev was intended to give a general view. But Solovyev, in the course of his studies, discovered immeasurable horizons in the quite unworked field of Russian history. Whole sections, whole epochs, proved to be almost entirely untouched by any special study, and the archives were full of huge piles of materials

of every kind which had till then never been handled by a trained modern historian. Thus Solovyev had to combine the work of a complete sketch of Russian history with the widest original investigations. He did not shirk this task, and with an iron persistency and energy he was the first to bring order into the enormous mass of unworked historical material. His history was thus like a kind of bottomless well of facts valuable to the historian, drawn from the most various historical sources. It would be a mistake, however, to regard the history of Solovyev only as a great store of historical materials. In many parts of his work he rose to a high level of scientific survey and literary mastery. Thus, for instance, the picture which he gives in the thirteenth volume of his history of the internal condition of Russia on the eve of the reforms of Peter the Great, was a brilliant model of vivid historical description.

In scientific arrangement, however, the work of Solovyev was very uneven. For this there were reasons of two kinds. Firstly, during the twenty years that Solovyev spent on his history, his own scientific outlook went through an evolution. He began it at the time of the conflict between the Westernisers and Slavophiles, and became one of the Juridical School of Westernisers which I have mentioned, and the mark of the Western Hegelian ideology is to be seen in many of the conceptions which appeared in his history. These conceptions are often penetrated with the idea that the process of history may be reduced to a logical succession of principles which lie at the foundation of juridical life. From this point of view Russian history must be understood as the gradual triumph of the State principle over the remains of the ancient clan life. From this central idea come many estimates and interpretations of periods and events, and even many historical preferences and distastes of Solovyev. The relations between the princes of the Rurik dynasty from the Xth to the XVth century, and the political order of the Russia of that time which resulted from these relations, are represented by Solovyev as a struggle of the old ideas which came from the conditions of clan life with the new-born ideas of State. In Ivan the Terrible Solovyev sees the bearer and founder of the State principle against the aristocracy of the boyars, who were full of the vanishing clan ideas, and thence comes the undoubted attraction which Ivan the Terrible had for Solovyev, which even makes him gloss over the dark and sinister features of the bloody despotism of Ivan. The ideas of the Westernisers lie also at the bottom of Solovyev's attitude to the reforming work of Peter the Great.

The reforms of Peter are also considered by Solovyev as a great triumph of the State principle over the old clan ideas.

However, side by side with this view of history which he borrowed from the Westernisers of the Forties as a dialectical play of opposing abstract principles, in Solovyev's history one feels strongly other tendencies. Solovyev was by no means fossilised in the ideas of the Forties. He was very alert and receptive to the later movement of historical thought. He was fully receptive of the idea of organic evolution as applied to history, and even began his great work with an introduction in which he maintained that it is not the task of a historian to break up the history of a people into distinctive periods with mutually opposed principles of life, but, on the contrary, to note and distinguish the connected consecutive organic process of development. And this idea of organic development comes out very clearly in the work of Solovyev. It is particularly clearly expressed in his interpretation of the origin of the reforms of Peter the Great. Both Westernisers and Slavophiles were inclined to consider Peter's reforms as a sharp break with the past, like a kind of historical improvisation. Solovyev, on the basis of a searching investigation of facts, showed the organic connection of Peter's changes with the preceding evolution of Russian State life. He showed up that preparation for the reforms of Peter which was going on through the whole of the XVIIth century. Breaking loose from the old ideology of the Forties, Solovyev is often a genuine representative of the scientifically realistic tendency of history. He is not content with reducing historical facts to an abstract speculative scheme; no, he tries to take into his picture all the fulness of real historical life, and to catch the real connection of the actual phenomena. The evolution of juridical principles is not his only interest in historical study. He gives an important place in the explanation of historical phenomena to the geographical factor and follows closely the development of social relations.

Thus in the many volumes of Solovyev's history there is a succession of various conceptions of historical material, various views which in the strata of various times make up his historical point of view. And this deprives his remarkable work of any unity of method. Secondly, in many parts of his work, especially in the volumes devoted to the period succeeding Peter, Solovyev seems to be oppressed by the mass of materials which he for the first time drew from the depths of the archives and turned to scientific use. In his use of these materials he sometimes seems to lose the thread of his uniting thought, and some parts of his

history took the character almost of a collection of documents narrated anew by the writer. In view of all this, even after the appearance of Solovyev's monumental work, there still remained unperformed the task of a whole and synthetic survey of all Russian history pervaded with a unity of scientific thought. This task was first accomplished with unusual brilliancy by Klyuchevsky in his celebrated *Course of Russian History*.

Klyuchevsky was the son of a village priest in the province of Penza. His childhood and youth were spent in surroundings of stern poverty. Entering a religious seminary, he soon showed outstanding intellectual gifts. Both his schoolfellows and teachers began to regard him as a rising light and prophesied for him a notable future in the higher ranks of the Church hierarchy. But Klyuchevsky soon turned in another direction. He was not at all disposed to the life of a priest; he was attracted to the university; he already dreamed of becoming a learned historian. It was not for nothing that he spent whole nights reading Karamzin (Solovyev's history had not yet appeared) by feeble candle light, as his poverty precluded any better. However, in order to enter the University from a church seminary he needed the special leave of the local bishop. It was not easy to get this permission. Klyuchevsky had to live through many anxieties and vexations before he was able to settle his own career. Entering Moscow University, he became the most intimate pupil of Solovyev. That was a notable time in the life of Russia. The great social reforms were now being carried through. The long-standing question of the abolition of serfdom was being solved practically, and in this connection began a general reconstruction of social interrelations and public ideas. The impressions which Klyuchevsky derived from this time, as he has himself admitted, had a strong influence not only on his feelings as a citizen, but on his purely scientific interests. In the centre of these interests he now set the study of the phenomena of social life. The social structure of society in its historical development was what seemed to him the fundamental subject of study for historical research. Of course he followed also the evolution of the order of State, the history of State institutions. But he saw in it not a self-contained process of development and a succession of abstract principles, but an external reflection of internal changes in the social structure of society. This was the idea which he took as the basis of his principal monograph, on the *Duma of Boyars in Ancient Russia*. Here he shows how the history of this institution, in all its critical moments, was decided by the

fortunes of the class of boyars of which the Duma of Boyars was the organ. It was the Supreme Council of State of the Moscow Tsars. The dependence of the history of this institution on the social elements which composed it, that was the scientific problem which Klyuchevsky set himself in this monograph. His other principal monographs were devoted to the most important questions of the social history of Russia, the story of the origin of serfdom as connected with the history of the many various forms of bondage which existed in ancient Russia.

By this primary interest in social history, which reduced political history to a subordinate position as a subject of study, Klyuchevsky may seem to have drawn closer to the Slavophil tendency and to be opposed to the Westernisers. Sometimes in others' views of Klyuchevsky one has noticed this explanation of his scientific position. But this was a profound error. The truth is that Klyuchevsky was equally far from the starting point both of the Westernising and of the Slavophil school. If in the views of his teacher, Solovyev, as we have just seen, strong elements of Westernising Hegelianism were throughout perceptible, for Klyuchevsky both the Westernising and the Slavophil views of the Forties were no more than an already vanished phase of our intellectual life. Klyuchevsky approached his subject, not as a philosopher seeking in history the revelation of universal reason, but as a sociologist who sees in history the scientific study of society, of the laws of its structure and development. This was what made him specially interested in social history. He assumed that social life is everywhere composed of the same factors, but that these factors, according to conditions of time and place, enter into various combinations; and the scientific interest of the study of every national history is, in his view, the peculiar combination of these factors which has appeared in the history of the given country. It is from this sociological point of view that Klyuchevsky approaches the study of the history of Russia. He does not, like the Slavophiles, draw in principle a line of distinction between the vital principles of Russian and of West European culture. In this, he does not follow the path either of the old Slavophiles or of the new Eurasians. For him the process of Russian history is a variant of the historical process of the other peoples of European civilisation. But it is precisely a variant, and it is towards defining the peculiarities of this variant that Klyuchevsky's attention is specially directed.

This is the theoretical background of Klyuchevsky's plan for his *Course of Russian History*. This "Course," which remains

the most important work of Russian historical literature, is remarkable for the extraordinarily well proportioned distribution of matter, for the elegance of its composition and for the unity of its main idea. What strikes one most is the harmonious blend of general views concisely stated, with the vivid painting of concrete historical facts. The "Course" is in substance nothing but a disquisition on the main lines of Russia's historical development. But Klyuchevsky is never content with bare abstractions. He draws his conclusions from the facts themselves, grouping them with inimitable art, and presenting them with convincing vividness. Endowed as he was with marvellous gifts for systematisation and analysis, Klyuchevsky was at the same time a powerful painter of history; he had a profound feeling for the past, and could revive its outlines in pictures of sculptural clearness. This is why his conclusions and general views were free from all dry classification. He could finely appreciate and discern the particoloured diversity, the capricious and inconsistent meanderings of actual life. And this enabled him to throw new and unexpected light on many a historical problem. I may mention, for instance, the explanation he gives, in his "Course," of Ivan IV.'s struggle with the Boyar aristocracy. From the standpoint of formal logic, the most natural thing would be to seek for this explanation in the clash of political programmes. And what efforts have been wasted by historians in trying to formulate these programmes! Klyuchevsky approached the question from a fresh side. He drew attention to the fact, strange at first, that the literary mouthpieces of the Boyar Opposition—Kurbsky and the authors of the "Valaam dialogue"—had expressed in their pamphlets demands which actually belonged to the political programme of Ivan IV. himself! Ivan's opponents demand a share in the government for the Council of the Boyars and of the Country. But had not Ivan himself been the first to convene an Assembly of the Country (Zemsky Sobor)? It seems as if an obstinate and bloody struggle were raging around watchwords common to both sides. "But this is stark unreason," some strict logician may exclaim. "Yes," Klyuchevsky would answer him, "but who ever told you that life has no place for unreason? On the contrary, life is full of it, for it does not develop along a straight line, but in zigzags—and formal syllogisms alone will never help a historian to understand anything about it." And Klyuchevsky shows the conditions which were favourable to this apparent paradox. He shows that the struggle between Ivan and the Boyars was not in the name of political ideas, which were common to both sides, but of dynastic pretensions.

I have given this example to show how far Klyuchevsky was from that formal schematising of historical facts which would simplify life, deaden its bright colours, and force the true contents of the historical process into formulæ of abstract logic. No, Klyuchevsky was always anxious to make his formulæ cover the whole wealth of real life, he never tried to hush up its apparent contradictions and inconsistencies, but sought for the secret meaning of the past in these very contradictions and inconsistencies. And, along this line, he was often able to get brilliant results. No one but Klyuchevsky would have presented with such vivid lucidity the internal order of the petty Principalities of the North-East in the XIIIth and XIVth centuries, with all its inconsistencies, where embryonic forms of State order were so capriciously interwoven with the methods of private housekeeping of princes, who were at the same time squires.

The gift of direct insight into the concrete nature of historical facts made it possible for Klyuchevsky, after years of dispute on the part played by the Zemsky Sobor in Muscovy, to be the first to elucidate the real structure and meaning of this institution. The explanation given by Klyuchevsky was enough to overthrow all preceding theories, and to put the problem on an entirely new basis. Before Klyuchevsky, all historians took the Zemsky Sobor to be an assembly of elected representatives of the people; and the questions round which they fought was the importance which this consultative Assembly might have had in the public life of Muscovy. Klyuchevsky made it evident that the Sobors of the XVIth century included no elected members; that the Sobors were recruited not by popular *election*, but by official selection; and that it was not one of the forms of "union between Tsar and Country," as the Slavophiles put it, but a consultation of the Tsar with his own military and financial agents. This gift of Klyuchevsky's, of combining generalisation with direct insight into the past, producing as it did such brilliant results in special problems, is to be estimated at its full value in the composition of his General Course of Russian History. In this "Course" he offers a consistent scheme of Russian history, equally free from the old prejudices of both Westernisers and Slavophiles. Klyuchevsky's system bears the marks of scientific realism. He begins by fixing the main distinctive feature of Russia's history and finds it in the fact that throughout the Russian nation could not possess itself to an equal extent of the whole territory which was to be its stage of action. "Russia's history," says Klyuchevsky, "is the history of a country that is being colonised." *Colonisation* is the main fact of Russian history from beginning

to end. And the several periods of this history are, essentially, nothing but the successive stages of this colonising process. Further, Klyuchevsky remarks that this colonising process goes forward not in even stages, but by jerks and jolts. The nation was acquiring its territory not by spreading out, but by changing its lines of advance; for the anomalous progress of historical events would shift the population from one end of the Russian plain to the other, like the flights of a bird. Thus in the opening period of Russian history the basin of the Dnieper was the centre of Slav settlement, where the first germs of sedentary civilisation and state-order became apparent. But this embryonic civilisation and state-order were swept away by the advance of nomadic hordes from Asia into the steppes of South Russia. It was then that the population poured into the virgin country between Volga and Oka. (It is well to remark that this theory of Klyuchevsky's of the colonisation of the Volga-Oka country by immigrants from the Dnieper is rejected by many historians). There in the woods the immigrating Slavs found the Finnish aborigines, and the mixture of these two races resulted in the formation of the Great-Russian people. As a direct result of the conditions of this colonising process, arose here a wholly new system of social relations and political institutions, very different from those which had grown up in the South. The commercial Russia of the Dnieper gave place to an agricultural Russia, in which the whole social and political order borrowed its forms from the usages of the rural manor. At first divided between numerous principalities, great and small, this Russia of the North-East later gathered into a single Great-Russian State with Moscow as its political centre. This unification was brought about, to a great extent, under the pressure of external dangers, as North-Eastern Russia found itself surrounded by a ring of enemies—Tartars and Lithuanians—who were constantly encroaching on its frontiers. Military defence becomes the main directing motive of all the vital functions of the Muscovite State, which now comes to be organised on the model of a permanently mobilised military camp. The Manor State becomes a Military Camp State. This leads to the growth of the autocratic power of the Sovereign of Muscovy, to the destruction of the boyar feudalism, which had begun to form under the Udely (Appanage States), and to the institution of an order, founded on the enslavement of all sections of the population to the various needs and exigencies of the central administration. The transition from the old order of things to the new did not pass quietly and smoothly, but with heavy shocks. The morbid and

bloody symptoms of this transition were the Terror of Ivan the Terrible and the so-called Time of Troubles. The tangible result of both these events was the downfall of the class of great landowning Boyars, which was replaced in the foreground of history by the gentry: these were a class of small or middle landowners, receiving "pomestya," *i.e.*, land holdings out of the Crown lands, with the obligation of military service, to be performed for these holdings. At the same time the peasant population of these holdings become the serfs of the landowners. Thus Russia becomes an autocratic monarchy of soldier-landowners, where all the population is reduced to bondage and assigned to various forms of service or payment.

This military and servile order was extremely grievous to the population, but it bore fruit: Muscovite Russia, at the cost, it is true, of the greatest tension of all its fighting and paying forces, was able to wear down the assault of its external foes, and in course of time itself to assume the offensive. Then began a new period of colonisation. The masses of the people—which had for so long been by force of circumstances crowded on to the poor soils of the North-East, between the Oka and Upper Volga,—now that this danger was diminishing, streamed with unhemmed force southwards and south-eastwards toward the Steppes of the Black Land, whose fat and fertile soil attracted the husbandman like a magnet. This movement south and south-eastwards assumed the dimensions of an irresistible elemental force, and it is this new stream of colonisation that became the starting point of the transformation of Great-Russian Russia into a Russia of All the Russians. To secure the integrity of this ever-growing empire it became necessary to give it a regular and elaborate political mechanism, such as might put Russia on a level with her Western neighbours as regards the technical side of administration. It is precisely in the achievement of this task that we find the inner meaning of the Reforms of Peter the Great.

In interpreting these Reforms Klyuchevsky broke away from both the Westernisers and the Slavophiles. Both of these parties regarded Peter's Reform as an essential displacement of Russian life, as a revolution which turned upside down all its traditional foundations. Klyuchevsky laid particular stress on the assertion that the Reform was a matter not of principles, but of technique. The political principles of the State remained the same; Peter the Great's Russia was externally refashioned, shorn and shaven after the "German" model, dressed in "German" dress,—but

in substance remained the same military and servile monarchy as before. Only the administrative apparatus of this monarchy had received a new technical outfit of West European pattern,—which demanded for its upkeep new and unheard-of efforts from the population. The age of Peter the Great is represented by Klyuchevsky, not as a birth “from non-existence into existence”—as had been affirmed by the Westernisers,—nor as a black betrayal of national traditions—as the Slavophiles had imagined—but as a great national sacrifice, offered at incalculable costs by the whole population, which now had foisted on to its shoulders the whole weight of a cumbrous administrative mechanism, which was to secure the fruits of all the preceding labours of the State.

In bringing to a victorious end his great Northern War, Peter put an end to a period of unceasing warfare, which had been the constant condition of Russia for some three centuries. This removed the necessity for universal bondage, which had been the foundation of the system of national self-defence. The gentry were gradually emancipated in the course of the reigns of Peter's successors. The gentleman, from the servant which he had been, gradually becomes a privileged owner of land and men, under no obligation of service. The bondage of the peasants, simultaneously, enters a fresh stage of its development. In Muscovy and under Peter the Great the serfdom of the peasants was a necessary condition for the compulsory military service of the gentry. Now, with the abolition of compulsory service for the gentry, the bondage of the peasants loses its original meaning as a public institution, and begins, more and more, to approach not only in point of fact, but in law, a state of real slavery. Just in so far as the serving gentleman becomes a privileged owner of land and men, the peasant-serf becomes a slave. Klyuchevsky gives a large place in his *Course* to these social transformations, and sees in them the source of many pernicious developments in Russian civilisation. Klyuchevsky lays especial stress on the gulf between the educated gentry and the mass of the people as to their ideas and their conditions of life, a gulf which was the direct outcome of this rupture between the upper and the lower classes. Torn from its national roots the civilisation of the serf-owning gentry of the XVIIIth century became a dependent, artificial, hot-house civilisation, blindly imitative of Western intellectual fashions which, when transferred into the conditions of Russian life, fatally turned into grotesque parodies of their originals. The gentry and the mass of the people ceased to

understand each other, began to regard each other as strangers, and the gentleman educated on French books, and not knowing what to do with ideas taken from these books in his serf-inhabited village, found himself in a position of "intellectual uselessness." "He had wanted," says Klyuchevsky, "to be at home among strangers, and he found himself to be a stranger at home." His sketch of this imitative period of the gentry civilisation of the XVIIIth century, full of biting irony, is one of the most brilliant pages in the Course of Klyuchevsky.

The reign of Catherine II. was the moment of final consolidation of the new social order of the Russian Empire. By the end of the XVIIIth century Russia had finally become a monarchy built on a caste of gentry, in which the unlimited power of the Crown rested on a class of privileged landowners, and the foundation of the whole structure was the slavery of the people.

But this foundation was by no means firm. The people did not passively accept its enslavement. Every now and then the serfs would break out into revolts, which assumed in the Pugachev movement the dimensions of a Russian jacquerie. Thus, the social order which had come into force by the end of the XVIIIth century turned out to be built on volcanic ground, which threatened the whole political building with catastrophic convulsions. This fact and the gradual development of commerce and of industry sapped the foundations of the order based on serfdom, and the whole XIXth century was in Russian history a period of gradual destruction of these foundations; throughout the first half of this century the collapse of serfdom was impending, and came in 1861. The second half was a period of degeneration of the old patriarchal autocracy, which fell only at the beginning of the XXth century. However, the history of Russia in the XIXth century remains the least elaborated portion of Klyuchevsky's Course.

Such are the broadest outlines of this Course, which gives an extraordinarily consistent conception of Russian history. At the basis of this conception lies the division of Russian history into periods, according to the consecutive stages of national colonisation. On this basis Klyuchevsky divided the history of Russia into four periods: (1) the Dnieper period; (2) the Upper Volga period; (3) the Great Russian period; and (4) the All-Russian period. Each of these periods has its own set of social and political relations. Klyuchevsky gave these in the following formulæ: First period (VIIIth to XIIIth century), a Russia of the Dnieper, of towns, of commerce. Second period (XIIIth to XVth

century), a Russia of the Upper Volga, of petty principalities, of free husbandmen; third period (XVth to XVIIth century), a great Muscovite Russia, of Tsar and boyars, of military land-owners; fourth period (XVIIIth to XIXth century), an all-Russian Russia, of Emperor and gentry, serfdom, peasants and factories.

For each period the above-mentioned formulæ are developed in the Course, in the subtle analysis of political, social and economic relations, and their complicated interactions.

This necessarily short survey of Klyuchevsky's Course will yet, I think, give the reader an idea of its high scientific value. But, as has been already said, this Course is not only a first-class contribution to Russian historical studies. Its importance goes far beyond any such limits. These five volumes are at the same time one of the finest monuments of Russian literary art. In this respect Klyuchevsky must be accepted as a classic, on a level with the greatest masters of Russian literature. He writes a genuine, racy, expressive Russian, aglow with all the wealth of Russian literary speech. An inexhaustible wit—brilliant, trenchant, full of original expressions and unexpected associations of ideas—sparkles and plays under his pen. These features of Klyuchevsky's style made his popularity with the general reader, and they are especially apparent in the portraits which he draws of individual historical characters. Sometimes a single phrase, a single simile throws light on a whole historical figure. Whole pages might not have given such a vivid idea of the character of the Patriarch Nikon as do those four lines where Klyuchevsky compares Nikon with a sail that feels itself only in a gale, and when the wind falls flaps about, a wretched rag on the mast. And his detailed portraits of Ivan the Terrible, of Tsar Alexis, of Peter the Great and others, must be recognised as real pearls of imaginative literature. Often a short imaginative simile of his is worth a long dissertation in elucidating some complicated problem. These similes, like flashes of lightning, light up of a sudden the darkness of history. In narrating the process of unification of North-East Russia by the Muscovite power, Klyuchevsky wishes to lay stress on the dissimilarity between the way the principalities of the Volga lost their independence and the way the large self-governing cities—Novgorod and Pskov—lost theirs. So he says: "When a strong organism is dying, its death is accompanied by groans; in the same way the political death of Novgorod and Pskov was accompanied by the rise of legends, which put into symbols the ruin of their independence;

on the contrary, the principalities between the Oka and Volga met their end in silence, with teeth clenched, as dies a Great Russian peasant."

This simile is not only æsthetically beautiful in its pointedness; it is at the same time helpful, because it puts the reader right as to the very pith of the matter. Or, explaining the complicated and intricate system of the *Prikazy* (the central administrative offices of Muscovy) and wishing to emphasise the fact that these institutions arose not according to any theoretical plan, but as they were called for by current necessities, Klyuchevsky compares them to those outhouses, porches, storehouses, which used to surround the house of each boyar, without symmetry, added as the needs of the household called for them. Here, again, the comparison brings out, better than anything else could, the essential features of this phenomenon: it becomes convincingly evident to the reader that the public offices of Muscovy grew up historically, not in accordance with a plan drawn up in a study. Thus these artistic similes—liberally scattered over the Course—with Klyuchevsky play the part of a skilful and unerring pedagogical trick, by aid of which the reader's mind easily enters into the essence of the institutions and intricate processes of the past.

The individual features of Klyuchevsky's scientific and literary talent are highly interesting also, in that they are vividly representative of the national characteristics of the intellectual and of the whole mental frame of the Russian. In this sense Klyuchevsky may be called our genuine national historian. In the whole of his Course, in all his judgments, conclusions and portraits, not the slightest tendency can be discerned towards an idealisation of the Russian people and its history, towards an exaggerated estimate of the merits of the Russian character, of the achievements and deeds of individual men of action. On the contrary, Klyuchevsky's analysis is full of stern incorruptible criticisms; he ruthlessly unveils the national faults and vices; his judgments and opinions are, as a rule, steeped in bitter irony. And this favourite irony of his saves him from all pompous and melodramatic rhetoric. He is free from any stilted solemnity of tone. He never forgets to show the reverse of every medal. In his ideas there is not a trace of national self-sufficiency.

In one of his public addresses Klyuchevsky once said: "National self-glorification as well as nation self-abasement, are only unhealthy makeshifts for national self-understanding." And Klyuchevsky never resorted to these makeshifts. In this

sense he was very Russian. One of the most prominent features of the Russian character is precisely this organic distaste for everything stilted, pompous or bombastic. The Russian mind is mocking and ironic. And it is most ready to point its irony *at itself*. If there is a fault in the Russian, it is certainly not lack, but rather exuberance of self-criticism. At the bottom of this irony towards oneself really lies an unconscious fear of falling into the pitfall of pompous pose and phrase, for nothing grates the Russian more than humbug of pose and phrase. This national characteristic is strongly apparent in the historical judgments of Klyuchevsky. The prevalence of this tone of deadly irony in his narrative may even lead the superficial observer to suppose that at the bottom of Klyuchevsky's mind lies a heartless Mephistophelian scepticism, rejecting all that is sacred. Such a conclusion, however, would be wrong. Free from national self-glorification, Klyuchevsky is equally free from national self-abasement. He knows the worth of his nation, as every Russian knows his own worth. The Russian only dislikes showing off this latent self-confidence. But the very fearlessness of these self-indictments is ultimately founded on the fact that, somewhere in the depths of his soul, the Russian preserves a firm belief that, in spite of all his vices and degradation, which he so ruthlessly loves to denounce, he is capable of suddenly raising himself, when necessary, to the true height of his native talents and character. This belief never leaves him, even if in his transient degradation he touches the very bottom of the abyss. In the same way Klyuchevsky never lost his faith in the moral giftedness of the people whose historical destinies he had made the subject of his studies. Nowhere in his Course does he declaim about this faith. But the intelligent and attentive reader will have no difficulty in feeling the breath of it in all the turns and ramifications of the great historian's thought, on every page of the Course, not excepting those which are most steeped in invective and irony. Klyuchevsky's faith in the moral forces of the Russian people becomes only more significant from the fact that it is professed by a historian who is free from any kind of idealisation, who is fully aware of all the national faults of this people.

This faith of Klyuchevsky's was no unconscious self-consolation. No; it rested on an accurate knowledge of those conditions which accompanied the life-story of the Russian people. These conditions were exceedingly hard. The task of evolving a civilised community and a national State had to be carried out by the Russian people in the teeth of terrible external danger. The

nomads of Asia were ever advancing against the sedentary civilisation of the Russian plain, ever endeavouring to trample it down. Four hundred years, without even a single year's respite, were spent by the Russian people on a perpetual and universal war footing, in an unceasing struggle for existence with the hordes of the Steppe. The struggle required the tension of all available life-power. And during this struggle Russia found herself far behind her Western neighbours in political efficiency, and this circumstance brought with it a new menace to the national independence, no longer from the East, but from the West. Scarcely had ended the period of self-defence against the nomads, when Russia found herself obliged—again with the utmost exertion, with a feverish haste which anticipated the natural growth of her inner forces—to build up an administrative apparatus, cumbrous, expensive, and demanding the greatest tension of her material resources. This, again, was nothing but an act of self-defence, necessary in order to reach the level of her Western neighbours in military, financial and administrative efficiency. Russia had now by all or any means to regain the time lost in the long struggle with the nomads; she could not work by slow degrees, by gradual organic development, following the internal growth of her national powers. This is why the transplantation of Western administrative forms under Peter the Great took the same form of a crushing pressure on the economic resources of the people, as had belonged to the earlier secular struggle with the Steppe. The State civilisation established itself on the surface of Russian life at the cost of a terrible shattering of the economic strength of the people.

And this hectic, strained progress of history, though placing unceasingly heavier loads on the country and the people, nevertheless did not break its moral strength, and the people, after offering such immeasurable sacrifices for the creation and maintenance of the military and financial organisation of the State (which was indispensable for the elementary needs of national defence)—this people not only was not broken by the weight of the task, but found in itself sufficient moral vigour to contribute to the treasure of human culture such gifts as the Great Russian Literature and the Great Russian Art.

With his eye on facts like these, Klyuchevsky was able to preserve his faith in his people, in spite of all his bent towards scepticism and irony. And in every case when Klyuchevsky had to present those moments of deepest degradation—which are not rare in the history of the Russian nation—he never forgets

to note that each of these moments was only one of the zigzags which compose the broken line of Russia's advance. We find in Klyuchevsky the following fine simile: "Look," he says, "at the capricious network of country roads that intersect the great Russian plain. Looking at them, so tortuous, always turning, now to right, now to left, you may wonder: why did the people make these inconvenient roads, that make all distances so long—why not choose a straighter way? But just try to take a short cut, and you will soon convince yourself that you have made it much harder going, and that you are spending far more time, because you have to wade through some impassable bog."

It is easy to imagine what would have been Klyuchevsky's attitude towards the crisis through which the Russian nation is now passing. No doubt his patriotic heart—for, in spite of his Mephistophelean scepticism, he was an ardent patriot—would bleed at the cruel dislocation which Russia is suffering. But it is fairly certain that, in spite of his grief and his suffering, Klyuchevsky would never have allowed himself to despair of the future of his people. He would have known that this is only a new, capricious and immense zigzag in the path of the people, and that at the cost of great errors, sacrifices and sufferings, it would ultimately be capable of straightening out again its twisted road.

Klyuchevsky in two senses must be recognised as a great *national* Russian historian: first, because he has given us in his works a distinct and consequent outline of Russia's historical progress; secondly, because his own mentality, his way of thinking, his way of approaching people and things present the most typical features of the Russian character. That is why the study of Klyuchevsky's *Course* is doubly valuable for those who desire to get a glimpse into the soul of the Russian people and to form an idea of its fundamental qualities.

ALEXANDER KIESEWETTER.

SLAVISTIC STUDIES: AN ADDENDUM.

MY survey of recent progress in Slavistic studies had been written hurriedly, in order that it might appear in the first number of the *SLAVONIC REVIEW*, and this unfortunately involved certain omissions. Towards its close, in particular, there are certain gaps which ought not to remain unfilled, and which specially concern the Southern Slav, among whom, of course, I count the Bulgarians.

In Belgrade, since the Fifties, George Daničić represented Serbian language and literature at the High School, and as the chief exponent of Vuk Karadžić's scientific theories, worked for the practical adaptation of the popular language as the true literary organ, instead of the "Slavo-Serbian" hybrid language hitherto in use. The services rendered by Daničić to the cause of Serbian linguistic research are very great. He worked out various grammatical problems, analysed the rules of accentuation, edited an Old Serbian dictionary, and, after his transference to Zagreb in 1867, inspired the newly founded Southern Slav Academy, whose first secretary he was, to bring out a monumental dictionary of the Croat or Serb language on historical lines. The material for this was collected according to the methods which he had laid down, and he afterwards took over the task of editing and continued this till his death, by which time the letters A, B, C and Č to Čobo had appeared (Vol. I., 960 pages; Vol. II., pp. 1-56). This work, which is one of the foremost scientific achievements of modern Serbo-Croat literature, is still in progress. After the death of Daničić in 1882, the task of editing was entrusted to M. Valjavec, P. Budmani, and, latterly, T. Maretić: and so far seven volumes, and three parts of the eighth, have been printed. That Daničić could divide his scientific activities so completely between Belgrade and Zagreb is the clearest possible indication of the unitary character of the Serbo-Croat language, which has in fact proved to be the surest basis of that political unity which the world-war has accomplished. In this respect the life and work of Daničić was a symbol of the future. On his resignation from the Belgrade Chair he was followed successively by Jovan Bošković (grammarian), Stojan Novaković (literary history, modern history and studies in legal history), Ljubomir

Stojanović (earlier Serbian literature and Vuk's correspondence) and Alexander Belić (Serbian dialects and Slav philology).

In Serbian literary history special mention should be made of Vuletić, and now Pavle Popović, as well as Tihomir Ostojić, who died recently at Skoplje. Serbian history is taught by Jireček's pupils, Radonić, Ivić, and Stanojević. In the sphere of ethnography and "anthropogeography" a European reputation has been won by Professor Jovan Cvijić, who is at present President of the Serbian Academy of Sciences.

In Zagreb the study of Slavonic philology and history has centred since 1867 in the Southern Slav Academy, which owed its origin to the great Croat Mæcenas, Bishop Strossmayer. Here all scientific efforts were concentrated round the historian Rački as an intellectual centre of attraction. At the University, which was founded in 1874, mention must be made of the historians Mesić, Smičiklas and Klaić; for linguistic studies, Budmani, Maretić and, since 1920, Milan Rešetar, who was transferred from Vienna, and Jošić; for literary history, Pavić, Šurmin, Prohaska and Vodnik. Special attention has been paid to the glagolitic variety of the Old Church Slavonic language by Berčić in Zara, Crnčić and Parčić in Rome, and Milčetić in Varaždin. At the newly founded University of Ljubljana (Laibach) the two professors previously mentioned, Nachtigall and Ramovš, have been reinforced by Prijatelj and Kidrič.

In Sofia since the foundation of the University and Academy of Sciences, philological and historical studies have been busily pursued. The leading authorities on Bulgarian language and dialects are Miletić and Conev, and on history Zlatarski: while mention may also be made of Ivanov, Balaščev, Mladenov and Oveskov. Closer co-operation between all these Southern Slav Academies and Universities would be highly desirable in the interests of general Slavonic studies, and it is to be hoped that the political obstacles may soon be surmounted.¹

V. JAGIĆ.

¹ For errata in the original article, see p. iii.

EARLY RUSSIAN FOLK EPICS.

HISTORICAL evidence on early Russia is meagre, but if this meagre evidence is supplemented by the writings of the Monastic Chroniclers and epic songs composed by the lay population on the plains and waterways, a fairly comprehensive picture of the social and cultural side of those remote days is obtainable.

To the English student these folk-epics have hitherto remained practically inaccessible ; only fragments have been translated, and the originals, couched in ancient language, not to mention idiom, are not in circulation.

How and when these folk-epics, known as *byliny*, originated, who actually sang them, is a long story, and forms the subject of prolonged controversy.

The *byliny* are classified in cycles. The most important and historically interesting are the *byliny* of Kiev and Novgorod ; they are preceded by semi-mythological *byliny* known as the Songs of the Elder Heroes.

The semi-mythological *byliny* treat of gigantic beings endowed with colossal strength who, like the Titans, are doomed to extinction by the new order which is to prevail. The most important of these, somewhat vaguely defined figures is Svyatogor, the Hill of Light or Cloud Mountain. The bride whom Svyatogor sets out to woo amid the waste, whose body is likened to the bark of a fir tree, and across whose breast Svyatogor with his sword draws a great scar, is the epic representation of the mineral wealth in the mountain ranges (the scar figurative of the shafting sunk into Mother Earth to obtain it). The deep mysticism inherent in the Russian people finds expression in Svyatogor's death and extinction. Svyatogor, by reason of his colossal strength, can turn the world upside down, but he is not able to raise that little wallet in which is the germinating force of the soil. His end varies according to the *bylina*, either he vanishes through the crust of the earth, or lies down in a sarcophagus which stands waiting for him by the wayside. To the superior intelligence of Mikula, son of Terra, it is assigned to raise that wallet and to cultivate the soil. Again, the joining up of Russia's two main forces, agriculture and commerce, is depicted by the allegorical meeting between Mikula the ploughman and Volk-Volga, a reflection of Russia's first great trader prince, the mighty chieftain Oleg.

This archaic poem points out with poignant force the importance of agriculture to the Russian land. It gives to agriculture precedence over every other occupation, and advances the tiller of the soil to the first social position. No matter if the war-steed prance or other ills betide, the land must be tilled or the Russian peasant dies. Composed a thousand years ago or more, this bylina carries home a truth as applicable to the needs of Russia to-day as in the days when first it was sung. These semi-mythological songs give us Russia in the early dawn, the opening up of the great Varangian waterway from Novgorod to Byzantium, her rising city states and communal villages. Mingled with these comparatively modern subjects is the ever recurrent theme in myth, the struggle of light against darkness and in some cases there are allusions to a cult unknown and unchronicled.

From these semi-legendary characters the byliny pass on to the Younger Heroes and the doings of Kiev.

Though the folk-epics cannot be assigned to any Russian province in particular, they gradually came to gather around the two earliest historic and cultural centres, Novgorod and Kiev. The folk-epics of the Kiev cycle are attributed to the Xth, XIth, and XIIth centuries. Though intermixed with foreign matter and often overlaid by mythical and legendary strata from quite other periods, they are fundamentally historical. They first appear with the advent of the Norsemen, or Varangians as they were called, and were probably sung in halls at banquets. During the subjection of the Russian people to the Mongol yoke, the byliny merged into heroic or soldier songs, and gradually became extinct.

The word bylina is a term peculiar to the epics of Kiev and Novgorod. It is derived from "byt," the verb "to be," and signifies "that which has been" or something pertaining to the past: in the same manner as "Chansons de geste," the term applied to the French epic poems, describes a series of historical facts or gesta.

Among the Younger Heroes Iliya Muromets, the ideal of the Russian peasantry, is the most representative.

Iliya is found in a state of torpor or living death in his northern home. Mysterious pilgrims arrive and make him drink of the Water of Life. Iliya awakens to a new consciousness in which he realises he must forsake his father's plough and ride forth "to open up the road." He craves his parents' blessing and, armed with his club, which weighs 90 puds, he sets out on his good horse Cloudfall to Kiev. At his departure, and on the ensuing journey,

practically every detail in the ancient life of Russia is alluded to. Iliya, the peasant's son, is the people's own creation, the embodiment of the noblest ideals inherent in the Slav. They cannot part with him, and as the centuries move on Iliya is moulded to the times. Iliya, the good youth, is nominated leader of Vladimir's hero band, and three centuries later the old Kazak is seen riding at the head of the freemen of the Steppe. All through the byliny Iliya continues to be the benefactor of his people, and this rugged character is one of the finest figures preserved in epic poetry.

At Kiev Vladimir, the Little Red Sun, as the people fondly term him, holds court with his consort Apraxia in the white stone palace on the hill. In the byliny Vladimir is enthroned in the hearts of his people as a luminous personage to whom they look for light. In these songs there is no mention of the warfare he wages, of his political activity, or of the dual personality represented by the Chroniclers as before and after his conversion. In the byliny Vladimir is a radiant figure attracting by the glory he sheds around him. There is no mention of any consort but Apraxia, the Lithuanian princess whose face is likened to the pure winter snows, her movements to the gliding of the swan.

Humanised and Christianised, these figures coming down from far off ages are adapted to their epochs. Thus the old pagan Iliya Muromets is found in his prison cell reading "the Gospel Book;" and the Mural Goddess, one of the earliest of Deities, alone out on the plain bewailing the woes of Kiev, goes carrying a Bible.

Vladimir's banquets are the first Slavonic gathering in hall, and the byliny love to enumerate the many items on the sumptuous board at which the "Courteous Prince, the little Sun Vladimir," holds revel with the earliest Paladins of Russia, the Bogatyri. The most accepted interpretation of the word bogatyr is "boghatur," expressive of the dauntless horsemen of the Steppe. There is laughter and brawling at these gatherings, the green wine flows freely, and there is much boasting of doughty deeds. Some of the heroes come to the Court to seek a bride, there are recitals of amorous adventures, heroic maidens and wedding feasts. Up North, amid the unexplored waters of the Baltic, is the mythic stone, the Alatyr, surrounded by swirling currents. As time moves on, the Alatyr is made to stand at the cross roads to warn heroes of impending danger. During the time of the Crusades the Alatyr becomes the stone on which the Cross of Christ is raised. There is so much variety of subject in the byliny that there is something for all epochs.

With few exceptions, the heroes at Kiev hail from the lonely outposts on the steppes, where they form a barrier guard against the incursion of the wild hordes unceasingly being emitted from the Asiatic plain. The byliny delight in depicting the free, roving life of the bogatyri; they tell, and tell again, of their wonderful combats, and dwell minutely on the gory details. At these camps old Iliya Muromets, the peasant's son, is advanced as the foremost leader or Ataman. Dobrynya Nikitich, uncle to Vladimir, the ideal military leader of these early days, familiar alike in history and legend, is second in command, and the flower of Russia's manhood gather around them. These brothers-at-arms are all on one equal social footing.

The exceptions are the foreign heroes, Dyuk, Stepanovich, Solovey Budimirovich and Churilo Plenkovich. The aloofness and superiority known to have been assumed by foreign guests to Vladimir's court are parodied with delicate sarcasm in the byliny. There is the irresistible Churilo, at whom, while essaying at table to carve the swan, Apraxia tries to steal a glance and cuts her fair white hand; Dyuk, who complains that, crossing from palace to cathedral church he has besmirched with mud his fine moroccan-leather boots; and Solovey Budimirovich who, with thirty ships and one, comes sailing up Mother Volga river. Solovey is the foreshadowing of the Italian architects who were invited to the Russian court, while the wondrous towers he builds in which are "sun, moon and stars just as in heaven," are the people's epic representation of the cathedral churches and belfries of the Kremlin. At other times a thread of rough humour is shot across the tissue or, as in the Forty Heroes and One, the song rings down on peace "and the heroes ride out no more to stain their white hands with blood."

This is the glory, the zenith of Kiev; but, with her approaching fall, the song gradually tones down to a note of sadness and deep pathos, as when old Iliya Muromets calls out: "Oh age, old age! Oh deep old age of three hundred years! Thou hast overtaken the Kazak in the open plain, thou hast caught me like a black raven, thou hast alighted upon my riotous head. And youth, thou youth, my early youth! Thou hast flown away, youth, over the open plain like the glancing falcon!" With the desolation of the land Death and Sorrow stalk the Russian plain, uncouth figures bred by man's fancy appear and do battle with the heroes. The climax is reached in the bylina entitled the *The Last of the Bogatyri*. In this bylina, which is an echo of the fateful battle on the Kalka (1224), the flower of the Russian army perished. The bylina

shows how the heroes, not content with the victory they had obtained, challenged the heavenly powers and were therefore utterly routed by a mysterious host. The few remaining bogatyri seek refuge in the rocky cells and lonely cave warrens of the newly forming monasteries, there to do penance before the smoke-dimmed Ikons of Byzantium. This retirement to rocks and caves, or as in the case of Svyatogor to the inner precincts of the earth, is a frequent theme in the byliny, and is the epic representation of death by petrification—a form of death in which the characters continue to live on in the mind of the people: a people who for the greater part left their devastated homesteads in the South and followed the great migration to the North and North-east of Russia.

The Mongol Tartars, the goad of the South, are missing in the epics of the North. Held up repeatedly by the rigours of the winter, by impenetrable forests and treacherous swamps, they never reached Novgorod.

Artistic in form and accurate in detail, the byliny of Novgorod differ from those of Kiev in that they depict, in place of a nomadic race struggling for political unity, the more intimate life and inner pulsation of the city. The struggle here is for commercial supremacy, and a place in the markets of the world. These merchant traders, known as the guests, risk life and limb as in crazy boats they ply down the great waterways, or traverse the dreary tundras by caravans carrying their merchandise to foreign markets. The two main heroes of the Northern epics are Sadko the Rich Guest, and Vasily Buslayev. How Sadko, poor and needy, came up to Novgorod and grew so rich as to buy up the whole market, comprises all that fascinated the heart of early Novgorod. Sadko was probably a Khazar, that is, a member of a semi-judaised tribe living along the shore of the Euxine sea. Apart from the byliny, Sadko's adventures by land and water form the subject of a thrilling opera, with music by Rimsky Korsakov.

The bylina on Vasily Buslayev is one of the finest epic poems in the collection and gives a vivid picture of the social and civic conditions of the great Hanseatic city of the North. It conjures up her republican assemblies, her attitude towards the Church, her street riots and the factions of her turbulent youth. According to the trend of those times, Vasily with his hero band, or so-called druzhina, is made to go a crusade to Jerusalem; but to do penance for his sins Vasily challenges Fate by jumping backwards over the sad white leaping stone, the Alatyr throws himself, and so finds his end. The Chroniclers record his death in 1117.

Classed with these are some songs of a lighter nature. Couched in most ancient language, they are for the most parts songs of laughter. They were probably sung in conclusion to a number of more stately byliny.

Up to the reign of Catherine the Great the existence of this wealth of oral treasure among the people was unknown and unsuspected. At this time society in Russia was gradually following the lead of France; but the cold-chiselled style of French literature never really appealed to Russian psychology, and even when everything French appeared the fashion, a reaction had already set in and was making itself felt in the search for a new ideal, with national subjects and local colouring. To the astonishment of Russian scholars such an ideal was found among the floating oral literature of their own untutored folk, and these people, hitherto regarded as a mere drab mass, now seem to be a kaleidoscope of prismatic colour. A new school of ethnographers appeared on the scholastic horizon and everything pertaining to the folk was collected, sorted and investigated. Many valuable documents were brought to light, old speech-forms and proverbs taken down, the valuable epic, the Lay of Igor's Raid, translated into modern Russian. But for the major part the byliny—the *anonymous* productions of the folk—continued to be handed down from father to son on the lips of the people.

The first printed collections of these anonymous folk songs were edited in 1869 by the indefatigable Russian ethnographers Hilferding and Rybnikov. Having heard that the ancient byliny, folk-songs and folk-stories, speech-forms and ceremonial rites were still sung and practised in the northernmost dominions of Russia, they visited these regions and shirked no difficulties to come into contact with the old world rhapsodists who continued by heritage to render these songs.

The publication of the byliny is a landmark in Russian literature, the Greek clarity of their conception and the manifold themes they sang, called forth universal wonder and admiration.

The more primitive the conditions of civilisation, the more favourable they are to the continuance of epic tradition. Thus it was in the wilds of the almost Arctic governments of Onega and Olonetz, that Rybnikov and Hilferding gathered the material for their collections. Peter N. Rybnikov, pioneer of the Olonetz folk-lore collectors, was a government official and in that capacity came to be stationed at Petrozavodsk, a small town on the western shore of Lake Onega. In his intercourse with the people Rybnikov

got to know that the inhabitants of these districts still practised in their daily life many ancient customs, still sang the ancient byliny. He frequented fairs and wedding feasts, yet he was three years in this vast wilderness before he came to hear the songs he sought. He went to fairs, but there he met only the *Kalyeki*—that is, the psalm singers—but these recite only the acts of the Saints. “If thou wouldst hear about Iliya Muromets,” they said, “go seek a skazitel,” but a skazitel seemed difficult to find.

The diaries of these men give interesting details of the people and the conditions in which they found them living on their homesteads amid the swamps and forests. How ultimately Rybnikov came across one of the original rhapsodists is told in the following story :

“Aware of the distrust with which government officials are regarded by the peasantry, I donned the garb of the people, and, thus attired, took passage on a market boat returning from Petrazavodsk to Pudoga, where it was reported the old songs were to be heard. Though the season was far advanced there was ice on the lake, and the wind bitterly cold. Contrary winds compelled the rowers to put in at an island and there to spend the night. The dirty hut of shelter was already overcrowded, so I preferred to brew my tea by a fire which had been lighted in the open and then, wrapping my fur about me, lay down to sleep. Strange sounds kept me awake. A few paces off sat a group of peasants and with them an old, old man with flowing white beard. He was singing, and the songs he sang were unlike any I had ever heard ; now lively, fantastic and gay, now slow and tinged with melancholy, they were suggestive of something forgotten long ago by living man. One song finished, the old man commenced another, and I recognised that at last I had come upon one of my long-sought native rhapsodists.”

Rybnikov sees in the epic songs one of the main factors in the life of the people. From the cradle onward, he says, they accompany the Russian through life, they are the means by which these people give vent to their hopes, their aspirations, and their fears.

The byliny have been likened to a grand ruinous structure, piled up century by century, in which the interior abounds in mysterious turnings, and having additions from all ages—a structure in which lived princes who added to it the lofty terem, decorated it with Byzantine art, hung it with rich Eastern carpets, a structure which the dreaded Polovtsy and Tatars raided, in which Cossacks pitched their tents, Muscovite boyars held revel, in which even the humble peasant of Olonets found a corner.

Wandering through this mysterious ruin the archæologist opens up traces of various epochs and various historical features : here it is a Byzantine fresco, there some Eastern ornament that he brings to light. On other sites, a whole treasure store is unearthed and a cowl from Greece, the club which weighs ninety puds, sounding gusli or a brazen instrument proclaiming Teutonic origin, are found side by side.

The byliny are in just relation to the stories of other primitive peoples and their study has acted as an inspiration to most of Russia's great classical writers. Pushkin was the forerunner, Lermontov and Gogol followed in his footsteps. At the present time the modern school of Russian authors shows a renewed tendency to choose its subjects from among the themes of the old national treasure store.

KATE BLAKEY.

TRANSYLVANIA. (II.)

THE murder of Michael in 1601 left Transylvania for the moment at the mercy of the Imperialists, under the treacherous General Basta. But he and his mercenary troops and Jesuit advisers soon drove the population to despair by their extortions and misrule. Rudolf's absolutist designs upon the constitution and his attempts to reimpose Catholicism by force in his dominions, provided a double motive of resistance, civil and religious, and drove Transylvania back into the arms of the Turks.

The forcible seizure of Protestant churches in Kaschau and other towns of Northern Hungary by Rudolf's orders (the town church of Klausenburg was to be made over to the Jesuits¹) united the Magyar nobility and the German townsmen. The *Ius Resistendi* (secured under the famous clause 31 of the Golden Bull) was invoked, and there was a general rising, which led to the election of Stephen Bocskay, with the title of Prince of Hungary and Transylvania.² He was even invested as King by the Turks, on the famous electoral field of Rákos, near Pest. and accompanied the Grand Vizier after the conquest of Esztergom. But he wisely did not insist upon the Royal dignity, merely using his new position to bring Rudolf to reason; and the Treaty of Vienna, which he concluded in 1606, is a landmark in Hungarian history, because it secured for the first time a legal recognition of religious liberty, which was frequently violated during the coming century, but never utterly lost. It recognised Bocskay in Transylvania and nine neighbouring counties, the so-called "Partes."³ It lies quite outside my present purpose to define the frontiers between Transylvania and Habsburg Hungary: it is sufficient to point out that they varied very greatly according to the period, at one time coinciding with the actual line of the principality proper, at other times including Kaschau, Grosswardein (Nagyvárad) or even Debreczen itself.

The Peace of Zsitvatorök, concluded in the same year between the Emperor and the Porte, is no less memorable in foreign policy: for it ends Vienna's tribute to Constantinople and places diplomatic negotiations on a footing of absolute equality between the two Powers (till then the Sultan's arrogance towards the

¹ Schuler von Libloy, *Siebenbürgische Verfassungsgesch.*, I., p. 305.

² At Szerencs, April 1605, *ibid.*, I., 307.

³ Together with the district of Kővár.

“ King of Vienna ” and his envoys had been unbounded) : and it is shortly followed by the concession of special consular rights and ecclesiastical privileges for Habsburg subjects on Ottoman soil.

For the next generation and a half (1606–1658) Transylvanian independence is a reality, even though Bocskay dies prematurely and is succeeded by a particularly loathsome tyrant, Gabriel, last of the Báthory family. Habsburg aggression is impossible, first owing to the disputes between Rudolf and Matthias, which at last lead to the former’s deposition in favour of the latter, and then on Matthias’s death, owing to the complications of the Thirty Years’ War.

Gabriel’s tyranny found special vent against the Saxons : he burnt and plundered part of Hermannstadt and tried to do the same with Kronstadt ; and it was on this occasion that the Saxons appealed simultaneously to Emperor and Sultan. At last one of the other great nobles, Gabriel Bethlen¹, found his life threatened and fled to the Turks, by whom he was invested as Prince and who sent troops to help him to overthrow Báthory. The tyrant was defeated and murdered, and the Estates of the three Nations, meeting at Kolozsvár elected Bethlen as Prince. But they imposed certain preliminary conditions (recognition and restoration of existing privileges) : and this practice continued for the remainder of the period of independence. Bethlen reigned from 1613 to 1629, and under him Transylvania celebrated its Golden Age. At home he restored peace and ordered government, based above all on the old charters and upon equal rights for the four religions and the maintenance of their churches and schools. Abroad, of necessity, he adopted a cautious policy of balance, relying on the Turkish alliance for the defence of independence and constitutional rights, but showing quite clearly that he would prefer an alliance of the Christian Powers against them and continually feeling his way towards such a result. But he had given the Porte a pledge of “ devotion with heart and soul ”² and he took care never to lose Turkish favour.

The rock upon which all such projects were wrecked was the religious issue between Catholicism and Protestantism, and the attitude of the House of Habsburg towards it. The Emperor Matthias was a man of half-measures, and on the one hand not sufficiently fanatical himself and on the other too much hampered by the action of the Estates in his hereditary dominions and in

¹ Better known as Bethlen Gábor, by those who do not realise the Hungarian practice of placing the Christian name *after* the surname.

² Cit. Teutsch, *Gesch. der Siebenbürgen Sachsen*, I., 379.

Bohemia, to be capable of aggression against Transylvania. But even in his reign the appointment of the redoubtable Jesuit Peter Pázmány as Primate of Hungary (1616) seriously modified the situation. The tide of the Counter-Reformation, already strong in Austria, began to sweep through Habsburg Hungary also; Pázmány's tireless energy, his social skill and above all his educational policy, reclaimed a large section of the Hungarian nobility for Catholicism and divided the rest of the nation. His view was that Hungary "cannot remain entire between those two powerful Empires: either we must be swallowed up by the pagans, or else we must seek protection beneath the wings of the neighbouring Christian Power."¹ Thus his very patriotism allied itself with his religious convictions to accept Habsburg rule and often to submit to unconstitutional action on the part of the dynasty as a lesser evil.

With the accession of Ferdinand II. in 1619 the religious conflict became especially acute. His cause became openly identified with three aims:—the forcible reimposition of Catholicism, the establishment of absolute power at the expense of the constitution, and the centralisation and Germanisation of the administration. The Jesuit Stankovics prayed for "the glorious day when the whole of Hungary will speak but one language, and will be united in the ancient faith"²: and this sums up the attitude of those who regarded the Turks and the Protestants as equal dangers and gave the extermination of the latter precedence over war with the former. The attitude of their opponents is to be seen in a popular cry of the period: "Rather Allah, than 'Wer da?'"

Bethlen became at one and the same time the champion of Hungary's constitutional liberties and of Hungarian Protestantism. In the opening Thirty Years' Wars he actively espoused the cause of Bohemia and did all he could by diplomatic means to unite the Calvinists and Lutherans of Germany for mutual defence. When Bohemia was in open revolt and chose the Elector Frederick as its King, Bethlen marched against the Habsburgs, overran the whole of Slovakia and was elected King of Hungary at a Diet held in Neusohl. But he wisely refrained from being crowned, and, when Bohemian independence collapsed at the battle of the White Mountain, he soon realised

¹ Cit. Andrassy, *Development of Hungarian Constitutional Liberty*, p. 461.

² Cit. Knatchbull-Hugessen, *Political Evolution of the Hungarian Nation*, I., p. 150.

that he was not strong enough to stem the tide, and gradually entered into negotiations with the Emperor, which led, in 1622, to the Treaty of Nikolsburg. By it he renounced the royal title, but remained Prince of Transylvania, and was created a Prince of the Empire, with Oppeln and Ratibor as hereditary duchies. Seven Hungarian counties were left in his actual possession,¹ though under the legal jurisdiction of the Palatine (*i.e.*, of Habsburg Hungary) and though sending delegates to the Hungarian Parliament. Ferdinand granted a full amnesty to the Estates and to the population generally in his part of Hungary, and confirmed all constitutional rights of Hungary and the religious concessions of the Treaty of Vienna.

This treaty did not end the conflict or assure permanent peace, but it marks the establishment of a certain balance of forces. In effect it prolonged the partition of Hungary, but it also saved Hungary from the national extinction to which the Habsburgs reduced Bohemia during the XVIIth century. By the close of the century the high-water mark of religious intolerance and of princely absolutism had been passed, and in the XVIIIth century both assumed milder forms, which no longer offered the same acute danger to the nation. For the rest of his reign Bethlen was a figure of international politics. He married Catherine of Brandenburg and so entered the intimate circle of North German Protestantism. He concluded an alliance in 1626 with Denmark, when its King entered the Thirty Years' War as Protestant champion, and even with Holland and England; then, after the Danish failure, he again allied himself with Gustavus Adolphus, his brother-in-law, and was preparing for a parallel campaign with him when, in 1629, he died. Meanwhile, at home he improved administrative and judicial conditions, showed himself ahead of his age in matters of religious tolerance, and did much for education—notably by the foundation of the Bethlen College and the encouragement of students at Heidelberg and other Protestant Universities.

Bethlen's widow Catherine very soon proved herself incompetent to rule, and the first of the Rákóczy Princes was elected to the throne. Under his moderate and distinctly more pacific rule (1630–1648) Transylvania really enjoyed more relative prosperity than any of its contemporaries. Its curiously anomalous position continued—seemingly independent and free from Turkish interference save for the quite trifling tribute of 10,000 ducats, but in effect one in sentiment with Habsburg

¹ Abauj, Bereg, Zemplén, Borsod, Szabolcs, Ugocsa, Szatmár.

Hungary and in the closest contact with it, all the more so because its own comparative immunity from religious strife increased its prestige and influence with all those who suffered from the continual illegalities of the Habsburgs both in the political and in the ecclesiastical field. But nothing throws greater light upon this situation than the attitude of Cardinal Pázmány himself, who with all his zeal for the restoration of Catholicism, actually preferred that a Magyar Prince, Protestant though he was, should continue to reign in Transylvania, as the best check upon German domination at the Habsburg Court.¹

George Rákóczy, in the second half of his reign, was forced into fresh hostilities with Vienna, on behalf of the oppressed Protestants of Northern Hungary, and allied himself for this purpose with France and Sweden (1643). But the Catholic party was by this time strong enough to hold him in check, and the Treaty of Linz in 1644, though it reaffirmed on paper all existing rights and the freedom of religion, could no longer hold back the Counter-Reformation. A sufficiently clear sign of the times is the single fact that when the dispossessed Protestants were to be reinstated in their churches they only succeeded in actually recovering ninety out of four hundred.² And even then the Commission sent to arrange the transfer met in many cases with blank refusal and lacked the power to enforce it.

George Rákóczy II. inherited his father's foreign alliances and ambition, but lacked his caution. He had designs upon the Polish throne, and as ally of the King of Sweden invaded Poland, occupying first Cracow and then Warsaw. But in this he overcalculated his strength in the most preposterous manner. The Swedes left him in the lurch, the Poles were not on his side, the Emperor Leopold naturally disapproved and helped his enemies. His armies were dispersed and a large war indemnity imposed, and, as a final disaster, he found himself exposed to the vindictive anger of the Turks, whose express prohibition he had defied in embarking upon the expedition. In 1657, at the threat of the Turkish envoys, Rákóczy was deposed by the Diet, who recognised openly that their "existence depended upon Turkish favour."³ And yet they soon had the folly to reinstate him, with the result that Mohammed Küprülü, the Grand Vizier, with an enormous Turkish and Tartar army, invaded and ravaged South Transyl-

¹ Cf. his opinions as expressed to Kemény; cit. Fessler, *Geschichte Ungarns*, IV., p. 220.

² Marczali, *Ungarische Verfassungsgeschichte*, p. 85.

³ G. D. Teutsch, op. cit., I., p. 388.

vania. The tribute was raised from 15,000 to 50,000 ducats, two successive Princes were appointed by the Turks, and for a time it was intended to convert Transylvania into a mere pashalik. Leopold was appealed to for help, and Turks and Imperialists fought over the exhausted country.

The great victory of Montecuccoli at St. Gotthard in 1664 marks the first real turn of the tide, though the peace which followed it did not secure Leopold the advantages which skilful negotiations might have earned. But Transylvania never recovered from the destruction and misery wrought in these years. The princely power decayed, and for the remainder of the period of independence was held by men of mediocre attainments. Of the three nations, the Szekels had already tended to fall into the background for a century past, the Saxons could at best doggedly hold their ground; the real control was in the hands of the Magyar nobles, and they now split more and more into rival factions. Thus Transylvania, weak and distracted, lost its prestige and power of attraction for Northern Hungary, and was no longer able to champion the Protestant cause beyond its own border. Meanwhile the Court at Vienna was encouraged by this very fact and by its growing resources and military power since the Peace of Westphalia, to develop quite definite designs for the suppression of the Hungarian Constitution, and simultaneously, of course, of Protestantism.

This period, the main episodes in which were the Conspiracy of the Three Counts, the dictatorship and blood-tribunals of Ampringen and the first "Kurucz" risings, lasts roughly from 1666 to 1681, when Leopold at last made up his mind to summon the Hungarian Parliament. But while it met at Oedenburg (Sopron), a rival meeting of the Estates was held at Kaschau, under Emerich Tököli, the leader of all the Magyar malcontents and the Protestant party, whom Leopold's tactics had driven into closer and closer concert with the Turks. When, then, the Turks made their supreme effort against Vienna in 1683, Tököli marched with the Grand Vizier's army. But the tables were suddenly turned, and the failure of the Turkish siege was followed by the great Imperialist advance which placed Leopold in possession of the Northern fortresses, Kaschau and other strongholds of Tököli in the North-East, and above all Buda itself and the whole central plain. The whole situation in Hungary was thus transformed, and a fresh Parliament, in recognition of these victories, proclaimed the crown to be no longer elective but hereditary in the House of Habsburg. Tököli's

impassioned appeal in favour of the Turks and against the Emperor fell absolutely flat. His wife, after a heroic defence, was forced to surrender the fortress of Munkács.

In 1688 the way was open to Transylvania for the Imperialist armies. Negotiations followed in which the ferocious General Caraffa intimidated the delegates of the Principality into signing a document, expressing its unconditional return to the Crown of Hungary, renouncing the Turkish allegiance, pledging all military support, and merely begging humbly for the Emperor's confirmation of existing privileges and religious liberties.¹ The Prince and Diet were rushed into confirming this act of submission and merely sent in, as a kind of unbinding supplementary memorandum, the various points which they should have put forward as preliminary conditions to recognition. Leopold characteristically took note of the act of homage, but ignored the memorandum, though he had the wisdom to confirm publicly the liberties of the four Received Religions. In 1690 Michael Apafi died, and while Leopold refused the Diet's request that he should confirm the younger Apafi as Prince, the Sultan promptly nominated Tököli to the throne and made a determined effort to overrun Transylvania, with the aid of Tököli himself and of the Prince of Wallachia, Constantine Brancoveanu. But the tide had turned definitely against the Turks; Tököli, after some brilliant but passing successes, was driven from the country, and by December, 1691, the reunion was a final and accomplished fact.

The so-called "Leopoldine Diploma," issued in that month, is a detailed confirmation by the sovereign of all existing laws, rights and privileges, civil and religious, and at the same time a pledge to employ only native Transylvanians in offices of state. But though nominally reunited with Hungary, Transylvania retained its separate identity, under the Diet, composed as hitherto of representatives of the three nations, and under two executive organs, namely, (1) Gubernium or Governor's office, first in Alba Iulia (Weissenburg), but soon transferred to Klausenburg (Kolozsvár)¹; and (2) a specially constituted Transylvanian Aulic Chancellory (Hofkanzlei) in Vienna, quite distinct from the Hungarian Chancellory². This new status was completed in 1696, when young Apafi renounced all claim to the Princely throne, in return for a pension and a title of the Holy

¹ This developed naturally out of the College of 12, elected by the Diet since the reign of Gabriel Bethlen, which in its turn had evolved from the Council of 21 (7 for each Nation) created in 1542, and modified between 1548 and 1556.

² From 1694 onwards. See *Teutsch*, op. cit., I., p. 433.

Roman Empire, and in 1699, when Turkey renounced its suzerainty over Transylvania, as one of the main provisions of the Treaty of Karlowitz. Thus from 1691 right on till 1867 (with a brief interlude in 1848) Transylvania enjoyed complete autonomy under Vienna, forming *de jure* an integral part of the Hungarian Crown, but *de facto* being linked by a mere personal union and really controlled by the Emperor. In 1765 Maria Theresa stressed its separate character still further, by assuming the title of "Great Prince." The seals and coins in use in Transylvania bore the Imperial double eagle.¹ Of the three nations, the Saxons showed especial zeal for the new relations with German Vienna, and the need of rewarding this zeal undoubtedly helped to reconcile the Court and its eager ecclesiastical advisers towards respecting Protestantism in Transylvania. The return of the Jesuits, however, was one of the first results of the new *régime*, and, as we shall see in a moment, they were the prime movers in the project for Catholicising the Roumanians.

Transylvania's retention of her autonomy was by no means due to scrupulous observance of pledges by the House of Habsburg. Indeed, at the beginning, it was expressly planned as essential to the renewed designs of Leopold I. at the turn of the century against the Hungarian Constitution, and in particular against the position of the Protestants in Hungary. In this he worked in close conjunction with the powerful Cardinal Kollonics of Esztergom, to whom has been attributed the much challenged phrase, "*faciam Hungariam captivam, postea mendicam, deinde Catholicam.*"² The acute discontent aroused by this policy—a practical example of which was the reoccupation of the Protestant churches in the North and the prohibition of Protestantism altogether in the districts recovered from the Turks—was increased by extremely heavy taxation and by the economic miseries resulting from the long wars. All this combined to produce the famous rebellion of Francis Rákóczy, the so-called Kurucz Wars of 1703-1711. Aided by the complications of the European war, actively encouraged by Louis XIV. and at one time by Peter the Great, Rákóczy convoked the Estates, was unanimously elected Prince of Transylvania by them, and succeeded in overrunning the greater part of Northern Hungary. The high water mark of his success was the Diet of Onod, which in 1707 committed the tactical blunder of deposing the House of Habsburg, thus serving as a precedent for Kossuth in 1849

¹ Teutsch, I., p. 429. ² Fessler, op. cit., IV., p. 517.

and for Károlyi in 1718. But as his foreign alliances snapped in his hand, his internal position correspondingly decayed, and the peace of Szatmár in 1711, concluded by Joseph I. just before his death and ratified by his successor Charles VI., restored Habsburg rule and ushered in a period of internal calm, which was not to be disturbed until 1848. These events doubtless confirmed the Court of Vienna as to the wisdom of its action in keeping Transylvania separate from Hungary proper.

The XVIIIth century, then, is a period of reconstruction and convalescence after long centuries of storm, and relatively uneventful. Transylvania shares the extreme exhaustion felt by all Hungary; a pamphlet issued early in the century depicts her flinging herself dying at the feet of the Emperor, and this may fairly be taken to express contemporary feeling.¹ The constitutional position is stereotyped on paper, but in reality "the power of the Court had increased to such an extent that it commanded and had to be obeyed. Transylvania or the individual nation concerned learnt of the most far-reaching measures only when they came to be carried out. A paper power had arisen against which they were powerless. A good part of the history of the century consists in law pleas and petitions, in memoranda to the Hofkanzlei and the Gubernium, in complaints addressed to the Court. The sword had become blunted, and defence had to take other forms. . . . Not a general, but a statesman was required by the new epoch."²

The real control was in Vienna. The Diet continued to meet, but was increasingly ineffective, doing little more than register the contributions demanded. Its revision and publication of the constitutional code of Transylvania in 1744 did not in the least check illegal interference from above. The "absolute kaiserliche Dominat" was almost unchallenged.³ Its power of nomination was more and more asserted in open defiance of the right of election of officials as constitutionally guaranteed.⁴ This went hand in hand with an aggressive campaign for the re-Catholicisation of Transylvania. The Catholics, though in a crushing minority in the country, were assigned an absolute majority in the Gubernium. In 1716 the Bishop of Transylvania was quite properly reinstalled at Alba Iulia⁵: but at the same time

¹ F. Teutsch, *Geschichte der Siebenbürger Sachsen*, II., p. 49.

² *Ibid.*, p. 33. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 131.

⁴ In 1732 the counties of Arad, Maramureş and part of Zarand were reincorporated in Hungary, and were designated as the "partes reapplicatae." But the greater portion of the Partes remained *de facto* united with Transylvania.

⁵ Rechristened Karlsburg in honour of Charles VI. and III. The new fortress was built in 1716.

numerous churches were forcibly seized from the Protestants and made over to almost non-existent groups of Catholics, in each case with the aid of the military command. The Jesuits were allowed back, though expressly excluded by the Leopoldine Diploma, and became very active educationally. In 1731 an attempt was even made to induce the Diet to overthrow the equality of the four Religions, and to restore to Catholicism all buildings which it had held before Mohács. But though this aroused such opposition as to be abandoned, the aggressive policy persisted. In 1744 a Catholic convert was appointed to the post of Saxon Count, though the Saxons almost to the last man were Protestants—a double affront to religious sentiments and to the constitutional right of election. Secession from the Catholic Church was made punishable by a flogging of 25 strokes on the public square.¹

Meanwhile relations between the Magyars and Saxons steadily deteriorate. The noble attitude is well revealed in the words of the Governor in the year 1727: "The Saxons must not think themselves the equals of the other nations: if there should be no difference between the noblemen and the townsmen, then I will send my son to Hermannstadt and Kronstadt, and let him marry a tailor's daughter."² During the century there is a steady growth of the theory that the Saxons are mere "Kammerbauern," a sort of serfs of the Crown, who are intruders and have usurped a position of equality³. At the root of this is not only caste arrogance and racial dislike, but also the meaner motive of envy. The Saxons were relatively the most prosperous of the three, and were looked upon as fair game for an unequal distribution of taxation. The Magyar nobility naturally held the same views on exemption from taxation as their fellows in Hungary proper. In 1762 an attempt was even made to extract almost sixty years' arrears of the so-called "Martinszins" from which Joseph I. had dispensed them in 1705⁴; and there were constant efforts to undermine Saxon holdings in land, and especially to reduce the standing of those who had settled outside the territory of the Königsboden.⁵

Speaking generally, it may be said that the lot of the peasants was made progressively intolerable by the lords, as will be apparent in the case of the Roumanians. The best that can be said is that Maria Theresa by her Urbarium—a sort of modernised

¹ e.g., 1716 Kronstadt, 1720 Bistritz, 1721 Mediasch, 1734 Hermannstadt (where a new church was built on the Great Ring). *Ibid.*, p. 64.

² *Ibid.*, p. 109. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 53. ⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

⁵ In 1783 this was actually enforced, and was paid off finally in 1823. *Ibid.*, p. 126.

Doomsday Book—did a great deal to clarify the position of the serfs, and that she also placed some restriction upon the stringent punishments still in vogue (which ranged from prison to chains, flogging and often what was in effect torture).

After 1765 there was again an improvement in the position of the Saxons, due to the only Transylvanian of real mark in that drab century, Samuel von Brukenthal, whose name still lives in the museum and library of Hermannstadt. He managed to win the lasting confidence of Maria Theresa, and was at first Chancellor (1765), then Gubernator (1774) of Transylvania, and among other things reorganised the whole system of taxation. Nor was it a mere detail that in 1766 he secured to the Saxon nation the title of *inclyta*, instead of *alma*, as hitherto¹. In a country whose whole structure rested on privilege, this was equal to the strengthening or confirmation of status. Meanwhile it is necessary to note an unexpected decay of trade after the Treaty of Belgrade in 1739, due very largely to the wretched state of the Roumanian Principalities. Saxon commerce declines, and it is from this period that the rise of Greek and Armenian merchants in the Transylvanian towns date. As a curious indication of the trade situation—in 1771 in Kronstadt, of 32 non-Greek firms, only 12 were Saxon, the rest Roumanian and Bulgarian.²

Joseph II. visited Transylvania during his mother's lifetime, and is very severe in his criticisms alike of the efficiency of the executive, of prevailing standards of justice, of the attitude of the nobility to the serfs, and of the utter distrust between Magyars and Saxons, who were only at one on a single point—the repression of the Roumanian element. These unfavourable impressions doubtless strengthened him in his centralist leanings, and were renewed during his second visit in 1783. For my present purpose it is unnecessary to dwell upon the Josephine era; it is enough to say that he tried to bring Transylvania into line with his other dominions by the usual arbitrary methods. In 1784 the constitution was abolished by Imperial decree, the three privileged nations dissolved, and the whole country cut up into 11 new counties, on the lines of Hungary proper. The Edict of Tolerance, issued as early as 1781, represented great progress for Hungary and Austria, but fell flat in Transylvania, where all it contained, and more, had already been enjoyed for two centuries, despite many infringements. The new *régime* was resented by all equally, but hit the Saxons hardest, since the Magyar nobles, though hostile to Joseph, took advantage of the

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 286. ² *Ibid.*, p. 139.

change to encroach upon the position both of the Saxon townsmen and peasants, and of the Roumanian serfs. But even this advantage was soon swallowed up in the general discontent, and the solitary innovation pleasing to the Saxons, namely, the establishment of German as the official language, did more than anything else to rouse Magyar national feeling. The opposition against his reforms swelled from year to year, until the crisis produced by an unsuccessful foreign war forced him, almost on his deathbed, to issue the Edict of Restitution.

In Transylvania, in particular, the constitutional *status quo* was promptly restored; but the spirits which Joseph had evoked could not be brought to rest again. In the first place, the customs barrier, which had till then existed between Transylvania and Hungary, was not re-established.¹ Above all, the national question had suddenly become a burning issue. The seat of the Gubernium was transferred from Hermannstadt to Klausenburg, and remained there henceforth, because it was Magyar, not German; and the Diet, when it opened in December, 1791, at once demanded that minutes of the assembly should, in future, be kept in the Magyar language. Parallel with this went the Magyar movement for union between Transylvania and Hungary, which now began to be canvassed in both countries, though the time was not yet ripe for action. Its motive force was, of course, to strengthen the Magyar front against Vienna.

At the Diet of 1791 the constitutional position was completely reaffirmed, and commissions were appointed for the revision of local administration. But the events of the Napoleonic war affected even Transylvania, and its political life may be said to have slumbered from 1791 till the thirties of last century, and, indeed, virtually till the great year of revolution, 1848.

It may be useful to give an idea of the Diet on the eve of modern times. It must be remembered that as in Hungary proper, it was only the year 1848 that brought the first fundamental changes from the mediæval system of government; the bureaucratic innovations of the eighteenth century had merely been superimposed upon the old structure; 1848 was the first attempt at rebuilding. In 1791, then, the Diet had 419 members, but of these 68 were officials, 232 Regalists (persons summoned by the Crown), and only 119 elected. Of this total, 384 were nobles and Szekels, only 35 Saxons. Thus the Saxons, who paid 36 per cent. of the taxes, had only 8 per cent. of the represen-

¹ Teutsch, *op. cit.*, II., 354-5.

tation.¹ Till then this was not so serious, because voting was by nations, not by persons; but now the so-called "Kuriatvotum" was abolished, and the sole resource of the Saxons, henceforth hopelessly outnumbered, was an appeal to the distant Court. Compare this for one moment with the population, and the true situation will become clear. Already a generation earlier under the civil census of 1761, and under the religious census of 1766, the population of Transylvania was composed as follows:—

Roman Catholic	-	-	-	-	93,000
Reformed	-	-	-	-	140,000
Lutheran	-	-	-	-	130,000
Unitarian	-	-	-	-	28,000
					<hr/> 392,000

Thus, speaking very roughly, the Saxons formed little more than one-quarter of the total Magyar and German population. But beside them already stood 547,243 Roumanians, who were not merely unrepresented, but on more than one occasion expressly excluded from all right to representation.²

It is to this Roumanian population and its gloomy history that I now turn;³ their genera position I have already indicated. During the two centuries preceding the conquest of Hungary, we find the Roumanian element playing a notable part in Transylvania, especially in the mountain district of Fogaras, known as "terra Blacorum," in the Maramureş, and in the territory lying between Transylvania and the Banat, then still known as the Banat of Severin, where the frontier defence against the Turks was very largely in its hands, notably under its greatest product, John Hunyády. But social and religious circumstances led to a gradual assimilation of the Roumanian noble class into the ranks of the Hungarian nobility, those who escaped this process drifting into the two Roumanian principalities.⁴ The

¹ Teutsch, *op. cit.*, II., p. 338. Taxation was as follows:—Magyar counties, 719,220 gulden; Szekel districts, 136,431; Saxon districts, 489,320, or 35 p.c., as against 61 p.c., for Magyars and Szekels combined.

² In 1790 there were 86,630 Saxons and 65,570 Roumanians in the eleven Saxon districts. See Müller, *Beiträge zur Verfassungs- und Verwaltungsgesch. der Deutschen in Ungarn*, p. 28.

³ In 1733, out of 135,000 taxable families in Transylvania, 85,000 were Roumanian. See Fiedler, *Die Union der Walachen in Siebenbürgen*, p. 351; Müller, *op. cit.*, p. 16. Iorga, *Les Roumains de Transylvanie*, I., p. 219, quotes the following phrase from the XVIth century Magyar historian, Francis Forgách: "Tanta est in Transylvania illorum copia ut tertiam pene agrorum partem occupant."

⁴ In 1366 provision was made for the protection of the Transylvanian nobles against the Roumanians. See Kurz, *Magazin*, II., p. 294, and Müller, *Beiträge*, p. 16.

social status of the Roumanians as a whole sinks steadily, as the gulf widens between noble and peasant, and I must always return to emphasise the peculiar connotation of the word "noble" in Hungary and Transylvania till 1848—in other words, the identity of noble rank and political rights. Under the rule of the native Princes such privileges as were here and there granted to Roumanians, sometimes to those originating from across the frontier, came definitely to an end.¹ As against the privileged nations, the Roumanians remained a mere "*natio tollerata*"—a phrase which may be defined in the language of Benkö:² "*quod ius civitatis et accessus ad honores politicos Principatus publicos non habeant.*" Moreover, the legal position was that they be tolerated only "*usque ad beneplacitum principum et regnicolarum,*" and "*propter regni emolumentum*" (1579).

Their lack of political rights was accentuated still further when the position of the four recognised Religions was regularised and the Orthodox Religion (*az oláh vallás*) was definitely excluded. That Protestantism made no conquests among the Roumanians, is unquestionably due to the gulf already existing, racially and socially, between the privileged adherents of the new religion—Magyars and Saxons—and the unhappy Roumanians who formed the substructure of the state—the underground cellars, as it were.³ We now find two parallel tendencies: a certain proselytising zeal of the Saxon Protestants and a Magyar tendency to separate the Roumanians from their co-religionists beyond the frontiers, and, while keeping them as utter serfs in their own territory, to play them against the Saxons on the Königsboden, and so, perhaps, swamp or weaken the Saxon element.

As to the first, we find the town Pfarrer of Kronstadt translating the Lutheran catechism into Greek, then still the liturgical and church language of the Roumanians (1550), and another leading citizen, Benckner, publishing a Greek Testament (1559), and then the Gospels in Roumanian (Cyrillic characters) (1561); then the Acts of the Apostles, based on the Hussite Testament; then, again, a Slav gospel, liturgy and hymnbook (*Octoic*) 1562.⁴ Finally Hirschner publishes more books in both types (1580) and in 1582 a Roumanian translation of the Old Testament. But this

¹ Schuler v. Libloy, *op. cit.*, I., p. 365.

² *Transsilvania*, I., p. 472.

³ An interesting parallel might be drawn between the Orthodox Roumanians of Transylvania and the Catholics of Celtic Ireland under Elizabeth.

⁴ Müller, *Beiträge*, p. 36; Iorga, *Roumains de Transylvanie*, I., pp. 203, 241-3.

policy failed utterly, in spite of the very imperfect organisation of the Roumanian hierarchy and their consequent helplessness.

Much more important, however, was the policy pursued by the Princes of forbidding intercourse with the hierarchy of Wallachia, and restricting or controlling such Orthodox clergy as entered from the principalities. There was the clear aim of separating the Roumanians of the two sides of the mountains, and the shock of alarm produced by Michael's conquest strengthened this tendency. In 1564 the Orthodox Bishop Sabbas is expelled from office, and a Calvinist superintendent, George de Szt. György, is officially entrusted by the Diet with the task of preaching the true faith to the Roumanian villagers. Recalcitrants are liable to heavy penalties, bishops and priests to expulsion, as traitors to the State. In 1567 the same man is appointed "Bishop and Superintendent of the Roumanian Churches": the Prince orders the Orthodox clergy to submit, and also to substitute the "Roumanian for the Serbian language," as he calls the Slavonic, then still in liturgical use. In 1569, on Szt. György's death, another Magyar Calvinist, Tordassy, is appointed, who summons a Synod, and in it forces through the condemnation of the worship of the Saints, the prohibition of the Last Sacraments to those ignorant of the Creed and the Lord's prayer (a grim sidelight upon the ecclesiastical standards of that period), and orders the ejection of such priests as still used the Slavonic rite. In this John Sigismund (who himself had made the round of all four recognised confessions, beginning as Catholic, passing through Lutheranism and Calvinism and dying as an Unitarian) had the political aim of getting the Roumanian masses directly under the princely control—as an *instrumentum regni*. His successor nominated a certain monk, Euthymius, as Orthodox bishop, but Tordassy's activities continued, and the confusion was increased by the consecration of another bishop in 1578 by the Metropolitan of Wallachia, claiming jurisdiction over all the Roumanians.¹ The official attitude is shown by persistent references to the Orthodox clergy as "Pastores Valachi," not "sacerdotes." This jurisdiction of the See of Târgovistea was recognised in 1594 in the Treaty between Michael the Brave and Sigismund Báthory.

After the collapse of Michael and his schemes, however, the Magyar nobility persecuted all his supporters in Transylvania, and "ordered them to be killed where they could be found"²:

¹ Cf. Charters of 1609, 1659, 1663.

² Iorga, *Roumains de Transylvanie*, p. 288.

and there was an absolute prohibition upon crossing the Wallachian frontier, or on any priests coming from there. They were to be treated as "seditious and incendiary" and Roumanian monks, if caught, were to be publicly degraded. Attempts at proselytism broke down against the extraordinary powers of passive resistance of the Roumanian people. But the position was utterly deplorable—the misery and lack of culture in which they were held is revealed by the legislation of the Transylvanian Diet. Till 1609, even the priests, if sons of serfs (as most were), were bound to the soil and subject to all seigniorial exactions. In that year they were freed from "oneribus plebeis," and might move to some other place with their families, subject to their bishop's leave.¹ Yet even their married sons remained liable to the same obligations as the serfs around them. Section IX. of the *Approbatæ Constitutiones* (1653) contains the following phrase: "Though the Wallachian nation has been admitted *propter bonum publicum* to this country, they have, forgetful of their low station, infringed on some of our brethren the nobles, by the demand that they should not work on their feastdays; hence it is ordered that they shall not prescribe to the Magyar nation in this matter." Again, an Article of 1678 lays down that in future the Roumanian clergy "cannot be ennobled or possess property."²

The Protestant Princes of the seventeenth century made occasional concessions;³ for instance, in 1624 Gabriel Bethlen grants the clergy of Fogaras immunity from the tithe due to the Prince and to the feudal lord, and upheld everywhere else. In 1638 George Rákóczy I. makes a number of minor concessions to the Roumanian clergy, and again in 1659 Barcsay frees them throughout Transylvania from the tithe, as a reward for the services of the Metropolitan, Sava Branković, on his mission to Russia; but it is no exaggeration to affirm that the constant and avowed aim of these Princes was to proselytise.

In 1643 the Metropolitan Elias was deposed by the Synod at the Prince's instance, ostensibly for misconduct, but really because of his bold resistance to Calvinism. His successor, Simonovici, was placed under the jurisdiction of the Calvinist Superintendent Gelei, and, being a mere creature of his, accepted an "Instruction" of fifteen points absolutely irreconcilable with Orthodoxy. The Calvinist Catechism was adopted, and disputes between bishops and clergy were to be referred finally to Gelei's

¹ *Approbatæ Constitutiones*, Tit. VIII., Art. III.

² Benkő, *Transsilvania*, I., p. 473. "Græci et popæ Valachici nobilitari in posterum non possint nec bona possidere."

³ Hurmuzaki, *Fragmente*, II., p. 5.

decision.¹ One notable point was the introduction of the Roumanian language in religious services and instruction. No credit falls to George Rákóczy for this, since his aim was to loosen the connection with Greek and Slav traditions, and thus to undermine Orthodoxy in the Protestant interest. But its unforeseen effect was, in the end, to strengthen the cause of Roumanian nationality. This was the effect of yet another measure of George Rákóczy, which has quite unsuitably been claimed by Magyar controversialists as a merit of their rule—namely, the printing of some of the earliest books in the Roumanian language—a Calvinist Catechism, which the Metropolitan of Moldavia forbade in 1645 as heretical, and then, in 1651 and 1657, vernacular editions of the Psalms and New Testament.

The Roumanians continued throughout the century to be subject to interference and restrictions of all kind. In 1659 the most distinguished of their Metropolitans, Sava Branković, was rewarded for his services on a mission to Moscow by a remission of the tithe exacted by the Roumanian clergy. But the Calvinist clergy worked ceaselessly to undermine his position with the Prince, to assert their authority over him, to stop his salary, even to prevent ordinations by him; and at last, in 1680, he was condemned on a trumped-up charge of immorality, deprived, stripped of all his property and, despite illness and advanced age, thrown into prison. Pressure from the Hospodar of Wallachia upon Michael Apafi secured his release, but he died the same year. His successor was again a nonentity, subjected to Calvinist pressure; but under him the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Wallachia was clearly reaffirmed. Under him, again, were seven nominal Sees, including Maramureş, Munkács, and Grosswardein.²

Such was the position at the close of the seventeenth century, when Transylvania returned to the Habsburgs. Calvinism was driven on to the defensive, Catholicism tried to recover its lost ground, and the Jesuits, strong in the confidence of Leopold I., turned their eyes to the Roumanians as a useful instrument of centralist and Catholicising tendencies. They, like everyone else at that period, regarded the masses as mere cannon fodder in the spiritual war. They therefore bent their efforts on the hierarchy and clergy, to whom they had many inducements to offer. Submission to the Holy See involved the acceptance of four points—the Papal supremacy, unleavened bread, Purgatory, and the

¹ *Ibid.*, II., p. 12.

² Schaguna, *Gesch. der griechisch-orientalischen Kirche in Oesterreich*, p. 48.

"Filioque" clause in the Creed.¹ Otherwise the existing liturgy and canon law remained untouched, as also marriage of the clergy, the wearing of beards, and similar points of external detail. What was really decisive, however, was that the proto-popes had lost their freedom of election to the Metropolitan See under Calvinist control, and welcomed the union as a means of shaking off the galling Calvinist jurisdiction; that the union secured to the clergy who accepted it equality of rights with the Roman clergy and, therefore, a vital rise in status, and exemption for them and their families from serfdom and feudal dues; and that it provided for proper endowment of the Uniate Church and its hierarchy, whose centre was moved from Fogaraş to Blaj (Balázsfalva), once the castle of the Apafi family.

The union was accomplished in 1698, when 54 archpriests and 1,534 popes² followed the lead of the Metropolitan Athanasius himself; and its provisions were confirmed by an Imperial Patent of Leopold I., issued in 1699.³ Humiliating as were the methods employed, the standard at once rose, not only thanks to the exemption of the clergy from serfdom, but to a provision restricting ordination to clergy who have already passed a certain educational test.⁴ A further Imperial Patent assured the Roumanians that they were free to remain Orthodox, or to join any of the four recognised religions, and that it was the sovereign's desire "that everyone should live peaceably in his religion."⁵ In actual fact the temptation was almost irresistible, and for the next 50 years an Orthodox hierarchy and clergy can hardly be said to have existed in Transylvania.⁶ Yet once more we witness this amazing gift of passive resistance on the part of the Roumanian people, a very large section of whom, especially in the more mountainous districts, clung desperately to the old faith with all its drawbacks, and maintained a fitful connection with the Metropolitans of Bucarest and Suceava and the Bishop of Rîmnic. At last, after two generations of ecclesiastical persecution, borne no less stubbornly than feudal repression, the surviving Orthodox were placed, in 1761, under the jurisdiction of the Serbian Bishop of Buda, and in 1783 Joseph II. consented

¹ In other words, the procession of the Holy Spirit "from the Father and the Son."

² From Transylvania, 51 and 1476 respectively; from Maramureş, 3 and 59.

³ The final stage consisted in the ratification by the Synod of Alba Iulia on 4 September, 1700. See Schaguna, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

⁴ Schaguna, pp. 88-9.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 94.

⁶ Hintz, *Geschichte des Bisthums der griech.-nichtunirten Glaubensgenossen in Siebenbürgen*, p. 40.

to the appointment of an Orthodox bishop in Transylvania, with his seat in Sibiu. He found his flock in a condition of deplorable neglect, and had a hard fight; but henceforth the Orthodox Church, though expressly excluded from all privileges, is at least able to breathe, until it produced, in the middle of the XIXth century, a really great man in Andrew Şaguna, one of the regenerators alike of Church and nation. Meanwhile, by a strange irony, the subservient Uniate Church, thus ignominiously brought to birth, looked on askance by so many true Roumanians, and at first living merely on the favours of the Court, under the constant supervision of the Jesuits, was to prove the cradle of the modern Roumanian national movement.

R. W. SETON-WATSON.

THE EARLY DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND SERBIA. (III.)

IX.

PONSONBY'S tactics in the Serbian question were based on the supposition that it would, as was usually the case at the Porte, be very protracted. On 6 December, however, he learned that Butenev had decided to accelerate the matter by treating directly with Nuri Effendi, thus eliminating the Prince of Samos. That is why Ponsonby on the same day sent to Nuri Effendi his observations on the Serbian question, in the form of instructions to the dragoman Pisani, which were "intended to make Nuri afraid of the consequences of his being too obsequious to Russia." They consisted of a repetition of all the possible arguments against a Senate with life-members, which would be "a monster of a government." The Porte should support Miloš, "who has moreover now given a proof of his fidelity by daring to break with Russia, to whose will all his neighbours bend with unhesitating submission." He also informed Nuri Effendi that "the British Government will anxiously observe the conduct the Sublime Porte may pursue on this occasion, and it will afford the English and the world a strong evidence of the degree of confidence that any foreign Government may be authorised to place in the independence of the Sublime Porte and in its political sagacity."¹

On the evening of 7 December, Pisani found Nuri Effendi and Mustapha Bey, to whom he handed and explained his instructions. The two officials of the Porte were all the more embarrassed as the conference with the Russian Ambassador was due to take place on the 8th. They replied that the Porte quite understood the justice of Ponsonby's arguments, "but on the other hand it is well known in what position the force of circumstances has placed the Porte in relation to Russia, with regard to Moldavia, Wallachia and Serbia." Finally, after false and distorted arguments for and against the life-senators,

¹ 6 December, 1838 : Ponsonby to Palmerston.

they told Pisani that the following modification would be submitted to Butenev: "When the deposition and replacement of a member of the Council becomes necessary, the Prince of Serbia will be obliged to inform the Porte in order to obtain beforehand permission to depose and replace him." "The Porte," added Nuri Bey, "has the right to demand this attention from the Prince . . . Russia will never be consulted in the matter . . . the Porte will demand only from the Prince himself particulars of the proposed new member, and this will practically amount to what is demanded by Prince Miloš." In reality it meant a definite capitulation to the Russian Ambassador. In the preceding conferences, the Porte had accepted Butenev's demand, that the senators should be appointed for life. On the following day, 8 December, the final conference was to take place. All that Nuri Effendi said to Pisani only presented in a more favourable light the failure of the policy of Miloš, which was patronised by Great Britain. The British Ambassador was, although he knew that the situation was very serious, unaware that the negotiations were so far advanced. On 8 December, in communicating to Lord Palmerston the latest steps he had taken at the Porte, he wrote as follows: "It appears to me that this is a very serious question. I believe that the Russian Government feel that their hold over Wallachia and Moldavia largely depends upon their being able now to establish their uncontrolled influence over Serbia, and that they will do everything they can to force the Porte to submit to their demands." It was clear to him that in view of the Porte's weakness, open intervention was necessary, and that was why he recommended the matter to the serious attention of Lord Palmerston, with the observation that "its termination is likely to depend upon the tone Her Majesty's Government may adopt."¹

The question had already been settled, however, without the knowledge of the British Ambassador. When the deputies presented themselves to Nuri Effendi on 10 December and requested that the Porte should approve their plan of a constitution, they were informed that the matter was already settled and that the Imperial *Hat* would be issued in two or three days. Nuri added that the senators would be appointed for life. The deputies immediately communicated this news by letter to Ponsonby, who was extremely surprised, and immediately replied throwing doubt on the exactness of their information, since Nuri had spoken differently to Pisani. On 12 December Živanović

¹ 8 December, 1838: Ponsonby to Palmerston.

confirmed the contents of his letter of the previous day, and declared that he saw no cause to doubt Nuri's statement.

On the same day under the first impression of this bad news Ponsonby wrote to Palmerston that Butenev had gained the day, and that Nuri had consented to the appointment of senators for life. Alluding to the affirmation of Nuri Effendi that the Porte would remove any senator of whom Miloš might have just cause to complain, he wrote: "This is a mere farce, of which it is hardly to be supposed that anybody can fail to see the secret." And he added: "I will endeavour to address myself to the Sultan himself and to make him see the mischief his ministers are bringing upon him by driving Serbia into a state of confusion which cannot be cured. I am astonished that the Austrians do not see and feel the danger to the tranquillity of their own possessions which must arise out of this."¹ With his concurrence and approbation the deputies declared to the Porte that the Prince could not execute the Hattisheriff with the Senate composed of life members.²

As early as 16 December Ponsonby sent to Palmerston an account of his representation to the Sultan. Convinced that Nuri Effendi had settled the whole matter without consultation either with the Grand Council or the Sultan, Ponsonby sent a communication to Riza Bey, the Sultan's confidential secretary, and informed the latter that if this communication should be kept from the Sultan, he would himself have to bear "the responsibility of anything that may occur dissatisfactory to the Sultan which timely information of facts might have prevented." In this document Ponsonby argued against the impolicy of the establishment of the Senate for life, since, if carried into effect, it would inevitably throw Serbia into the hands of Russia. He pointed out the consequence of its being refused by Miloš, and then having to be enforced either by Ottoman troops (which was impossible) or by a Russian military force, which would be the source of a still more alarming embarrassment to the Porte, and might possibly occasion the intervention of those Powers of Europe who would not or could not permit Russia to appropriate to herself such an important possession as Serbia and thereby essentially alter the balance of power. "I added that such an interference was more than probable, and that it was rendered possible by the language the British Government was well known to have held to the Government at St. Petersburg, to the effect

¹ 12 December: Ponsonby to Palmerston.

² 16 December: Ponsonby to Palmerston.

that England would not consent to allow Russia to interfere alone in the affairs of Turkey.”¹

Ponsonby sincerely believed in the possibility of a determined resistance on the part of Miloš, who was not likely to entertain any illusions as to the situation which would be created for him by the new Hattisheriff. “I think your Lordship will be of opinion,” he wrote to Palmerston on 16 December, “that the Hattisheriff is in fact the deposition of Miloš. I have little doubt of its being so considered by himself, and if he resists, as he has declared he will do, the result may be very embarrassing to Her Majesty’s Government.”

In order to avoid all difficulties, Ponsonby endeavoured to persuade the Sultan—in his communication to Riza Bey—that the decision concerning Serbia must be dropped and nothing further done, that Russia would not attack the Porte on that account and that it would all terminate in “angry words.” He was nevertheless doubtful of success. “I am afraid I shall not be able to prevent the completion of this measure; but I have laboured unceasingly to do so.” Ponsonby here connected the Serbian question with the general policy of Great Britain. “I expect worse will follow,” he said, and pointed out that Russia might attempt to renew the Treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi and might undertake to arrange the relations of the Sultan and Mehemet Ali. He regretted the departure of the British Fleet. “I regret the loss of the support the squadron would have given, had Admiral Stopford been pleased to listen to my earnest solicitations that he would delay his return a short time.”²

In spite of the urgency of Ponsonby’s appeal, Riza Bey took undue advantage of Ramazan by not answering immediately. At last, on the 17th, Pisani brought the Ambassador the news that his remarks were “extremely well received by the Sultan, who passed an hour and half in reading them.” On the same day Ponsonby wrote to inform Palmerston of this, and said: “Therefore I almost venture to hope for success, but the affair is one of great difficulty, for it may be that the Sultan is committed.” Ponsonby’s doubts were well founded, for some days later, between 22 and 24 December, the constitutional Hattisheriff for Serbia, drawn up in the name of Yussuf Pasha and Prince Miloš, was issued. Articles 6 and 17—the cause of so many difficulties—were couched in the following terms: “There will

¹ 16 December, 1838: Ponsonby to Palmerston.

² 16 December, 1838: Ponsonby to Palmerston.

be created and appointed a Council composed of the most important chiefs among the Serbians. The number of members of this Council will be seventeen, of whom one will be the President. These seventeen members of the Senate will not be removable without cause, and without proof being given to my Sublime Porte that they have been guilty of some misdemeanour and of some violation of the laws and regulations of the country."

Riza Bey at last sent his answer to Ponsonby, and explained the attitude of the Porte in the Serbian Constitutional question. He referred quite logically to Russia's right of intervention in the affairs of Serbia, but everything that followed this introduction was a tissue of lies or false arguments, whose object was to give the British Ambassador a favourable impression of the results of the negotiations. It was superfluous to state, he reasoned, that as the treaties of Bucarest, of Akerman and of Adrianople contained clauses which authorised the Russian Government to intervene in the affairs of Serbia, and as in consequence the provisions of the firmans of 1830 and 1833 had been drawn up in concert with the Russian Mission, so the co-operation of this Russian Mission in the forthcoming constitution was, by the nature of the question, indispensable. Hence, after having drafted this constitution in conjunction with the Serbian deputies, they communicated it to the Russian Mission, which made its observations and demanded that the life membership of the members of the Council should be established therein. The Mission declared also that Russia had to co-operate in the Constitution, and the acceptance of this and other points would have meant that the Russian Consul at Belgrade would be authorised to interfere in Serbian affairs. The Porte, however, protested energetically and took part in great discussions for more than a month. Finally we succeeded in obtaining the renunciation of the whole of the clause which might have exposed Serbian affairs to the intervention of Russian Consuls. It was established in principle that the members of the Council can be changed and replaced with the permission of the Sublime Porte, but that (as already stated in the Hattisheff of 1830) a member shall not be removed so long as he has not committed some misdemeanour with regard to the Sublime Porte, or conducted himself in a manner contrary to the laws of the country, and this modification was adopted. Further, instead of saying that Russia has co-operated with the Sublime Porte in the drawing up of the Constitution, it is stated that the latter springs from the sole will of His Highness, "and this is

calculated to prevent Russian intrigues and to guarantee the complete maintenance of the rights of the Sublime Porte, established by the Hattisheriff of 1830, with regard to the changing of the members of the Council." When the Prince wished to remove a member of the Council, he would inform the Sublime Porte and it would be said that it had been proved that this individual had committed an offence against the Ottoman Government . . . it was clear that neither Russia nor the Serbian nation would be able to say anything to that. Thus the Prince's authority would be rendered complete and entire, and good order would prevail." All things considered, the Porte believed it had done everything to safeguard its rights against Russia. "Even supposing that on account of England the Sublime Porte abandoned the rights established by the Hattisheriff of 1830, Russia would never consent, and there is no doubt, judging from the latter's conduct and language, that if this matter were carried any further, it would assume a grave character." He concluded by stating that the British Ambassador would admit that "it would be imprudent of the Ottoman Government in its present position to offend Russia and provoke a quarrel." In short, it appeared as though Russia was hoodwinked and Miloš had triumphed, as Riza Bey unswervingly maintained. "One cannot," he wrote, "but congratulate the Prince on having finally won his cause, when to these advantages which the deputies appear to have scored is added the promise of His Highness to grant his approval, without investigation, whenever Prince Miloš considers it necessary to remove a member of the Council. This promise, given directly to the British Ambassador, has the same value as any provision of the Hattisheriff."

The most interesting part about these Turkish dialectics is that Ponsonby took them seriously. On 27 December he wrote to Palmerston that he was satisfied with the result of the steps he had taken, and that he thought Prince Miloš ought to be equally satisfied, "at least for the present." He wrote also, in general terms, to Hodges, and begged him "to keep the Prince quiet," till he should have heard from him the true state of affairs.¹ In this state of affairs Nuri Effendi plucked up courage to ask a great favour of the Ambassador. He begged him to use his influence with Prince Miloš in favour of accepting the Hattisheriff, which would be handed to him by the Pasha of Belgrade owing to the refusal of the Serbian deputies to receive it.²

¹ 27 December, 1838 : Ponsonby to Palmerston.

² 26 December, 1838 : Pisani to Ponsonby.

X.

Everything considered, the policy of Hodges was a failure, and for several reasons. In the first place, Miloš was not only an autocrat, but also an incorrigible despot and it was impossible to inaugurate with him a fair and just administrative system. In these circumstances the majority of the people ranged themselves on the side of the Chiefs, who endeavoured by every means to limit the Prince's authority. Without the support of the people Miloš could not successfully oppose Russia in the question of the Constitution, the latter's policy being based on the treaties between herself and the Porte. Hodges by his action only revived the influence of Russia. In February, 1839, Metternich, referring to the Serbian Constitution, said to the British Chargé d'Affaires at Vienna that "it was an unfortunate circumstance that Colonel Hodges seemed to have misunderstood the relative position of the two parties in Serbia, for in supporting Miloš he had unwittingly been playing the game of the other party who were compelled to have recourse to Russian influence." There was still indeed the intervention of Great Britain upon which Hodges had to a great extent and in all sincerity reckoned. But here he had misunderstood the intentions of his Government. Everywhere in the East Great Britain opposed the policy of Russia, and the representatives of the two Powers everywhere contended eagerly for influence. By temperament Hodges was one of the most energetic of British agents, and all the more so because he was a soldier and a novice in diplomacy. For the latter reason he misapprehended also the importance of the part that Serbia would be able to play in the struggle between Russia and Britain. Miloš, in order to free himself from the control of Russia and that of a Senate with life-members, followed blindly in his wake. As Palmerston said, Great Britain could not engage in war with Russia solely on Serbia's account. In other words, Miloš could count on her open intervention only if the two Powers became involved in an armed conflict for greater interests than the Serbian Constitution. For Palmerston it was a question of only local importance, whereas Hodges attributed to it a capital and general importance. Palmerston encouraged the Porte to resist the demands of Russia, even as he encouraged Miloš through Hodges; he advised it to increase and perfect its army and navy, and sent military agents to study the state of the Turkish fortresses, all this in apprehension of a conflict which appeared to him to be imminent, but which

he did not wish to provoke. In order to profit by the rivalry between Russia and Britain, Miloš's only course was to wait patiently. This he did not do and ended by capitulating.

The intervention of Hodges in the internal policy of Serbia left an impression in the country that Britain had directly opposed the liberty of the people, and even the establishment of the National Assembly. Somewhere between 10 and 16 March, 1839, Hodges received a visit from Stojan Simić, one of the principal agitators against Miloš. He had probably been sent in order to sound Hodges about the future intentions of his Government. In the course of the interview, Simić said to him: "You have always been mistaken in trying to support the Prince in opposition to the free will of the people. He is a man so bigoted in his errors and false notions of government, that no promises are binding upon him. And we all know that you used your utmost efforts in opposing the Senate for life and the establishment of a general assembly of the people, to whom the Council would have to render an account of its actions. We also know that Lord Ponsonby was warmly opposed to the clause instituting annual assemblies of the nation, and we have only won this important measure through the instrumentality of Mr. Butenev, who has obtained it from the Porte in a separate firman."

Hodges defended his Government as well as he could, declaring that the latter had never been opposed to a national assembly, but that the Ambassador at Constantinople must have serious reason to fear that such an institution might excite the jealousy of a neighbouring state (*viz.*, Austria). With regard to the Senate with life-members, Hodges stated openly to Simić that he was still convinced that that institution "would prove destructive to Serbian independence." In communicating this interview to Palmerston, Hodges wrote that nobody regretted more than himself the opposition of Ponsonby in the question of introducing the National Assembly into the Serbian Constitution. "It was not for a humble individual, holding a subordinate office under Her Majesty's Government, to resist the views of his superior; but whilst at Constantinople, I felt it my duty to use every means within my power for impressing on His Excellency the policy of our adopting that institution. It did appear to me that it was was one well suited to the exigencies and actual condition of the Serbians, from whom some reasonable and liberal form of government can no longer be withheld In our hands it might have become a most important and powerful political lever. It would have given us that hold on the public mind and that popularity

we so materially needed. The opportunity neglected by us was seized by our rival. We have been outbidden in liberal institutions."

Almost at the same moment Metternich emphasised how inconsistent with Britain's liberal traditions was the policy which her representative had supported in Serbia when he defended the absolutism of Prince Miloš. Speaking of his satisfaction at seeing that the Serbian Constitution would put an end to this absolutism, Metternich said to the British *Chargé d'Affaires*: "You will scarcely accuse Austria of an eagerness to advocate ultra-liberal measures, and yet, curious as it may seem in the present instance, we find ourselves rather urging the limitation of absolute government, and your representative acting in a contrary way." He confessed that in this matter Austria—for her own reasons—was in agreement with Russia. Miloš, by abusing his authority, drove the people to open revolt; Austria wanted peace on her frontiers, and the Constitution was the means to this end, the only means of removing all pretext for interference on the part of Russia. "Do not imagine," he said, "that because the Austrian and Russian Cabinets are now acting together on this question Austria is dragged on by Russia, for such is not the case. We both desire the same end, and happen to agree upon the mode of attaining it, and certainly, of the two, it must be allowed that Austria, by her geographical position alone, is far more interested in its success than any other Power."

MICHAEL GAVRILOVIĆ.

BULGARIA UNDER PRINCE ALEXANDER.

THE Treaty of Berlin decided the fate of the Balkans for the next four decades, although many of its provisions were never fulfilled and others were flouted within a few years of its signature. Bulgaria herself had in the first place to fight for her liberty once again, and the earliest phase of her history after the emancipation is the record of her struggle with Russia—Bulgaria seeking to retain her newly won independence, Russia seeking, by fair means and by foul, to influence and control, if not to absorb, the new Slav State. Closely interwoven with the national issues at stake is the dramatic story of Bulgaria's first Prince, Alexander of Battenberg. The story has its special interest, as an instance—perhaps the last instance that will ever occur—of the way in which the private personal animosity of one sovereign against another could become a dominant factor in international politics.

It seemed certain at first that Russia would impose her will on Bulgaria. Almost every condition pointed to this end. The Bulgars were bound to Russia by ties of gratitude and kinship; a Russian Commissary was, under the Treaty of Berlin, appointed as head of the Provisional Government; 50,000 Russian troops were to occupy the country for some months; Russian officers came to raise and train the Bulgarian army; Russian officials filled all the chief Government posts; the Constitution itself was drafted by the Russian Commissary, Prince Dondukov-Korsakov; the Prince whom the Constituent Assembly at Trnovo elected was the favorite nephew of Tsar Alexander II. of Russia. In modern language it would be said that Russia had a mandate from the Great Powers to govern Bulgaria. With all this weight of Russian influence imposed on a newly emancipated people, very few of whom had had any experience of public life, whose own language did not even contain words to express official or technical terms, there was a good deal of justification for the Russians, if, from the outset, they regarded Bulgaria as a new dependency of the Imperial Crown.

The Constitution provided the Bulgars with an autocratic ruler, and, at the same time, with a free Parliament, the Sobranje,

which was to consist of a single Chamber to be elected by universal manhood suffrage, with the right to make laws and to impose taxes. The most approved liberal principles were embodied in the Constitution :—equality of all men before the law, freedom of the press, liberty of worship, right of public assembly, compulsory free education. On the other hand, the Prince, as Head of the Army, could appoint and dismiss all army officers; he could also appoint and dismiss his Cabinet, who were not necessarily members of the Sobranje, and who were responsible to him alone; the Prince could dissolve the Sobranje and order fresh elections; all laws must have his assent. No provision was made for the contingency of a disagreement between the Sobranje and the Prince. It was thought that, when Prince Dondukov drafted the Constitution, he was hoping that he himself might be elected first Prince of Bulgaria, and that he was consequently careful to safeguard his own position, but that, when he learnt that no Russian candidate would be eligible, he modified the Constitution so as to limit the Prince's power. Besides the ordinary Sobranje, there was the Grand Sobranje, an elected assembly which was to be called together to decide special questions only—territorial, constitutional, or dynastic changes.

Much additional light has been thrown on the reign of Prince Alexander by the recent publication of many of his own letters and other private papers. These papers were entrusted by Prince Alexander's widow, Countess Hartenau, to the compiler, Signor Corti, who is her son-in-law. The book is of great interest,¹ not only because it gives a full length portrait of the unfortunate Prince himself, but also because it includes hitherto unpublished—and sometimes amazing—letters from Queen Victoria, the Emperor William I., the Tsars Alexander II. and III. of Russia, King Milan of Serbia, as well as records of conversations with Bismarck and most of the leading statesmen of the time. This book of Corti's and two books by von Huhn, which give a detailed contemporary account of the epoch, are the best available authorities for the events of Prince Alexander's reign.

Prince Alexander of Battenberg was the son of Prince Alexander of Hesse; he was brother of Prince Louis of Battenberg, the British Admiral who later was known as the Marquis of Milford Haven, and also of Prince Henry of Battenberg, who married Princess Beatrice. His father's sister was married to Tsar Alexander II. of Russia, and he was their favourite nephew. He was an officer in the Prussian Guards, but had served as a

¹ See very full review in No. I of SLAVONIC REVIEW.—ED.

volunteer with the 9th Russian Dragoons in the Russo-Turkish War—a fact which no doubt influenced the Constituent Assembly at Trnovo in his favour.

The Prince, who at the time of his election was only twenty-two years of age, was tall and extremely handsome. Impetuous, high-handed, open-hearted and unable to conceal his feelings, he had not the makings of a diplomat; on the other hand, he had winning manners, quick intelligence and insight; he was courageous and upright and he was, above all, a keen soldier.

At first, the Prince seems to have regarded Russia as his Suzerain as a matter of course. The Tsar himself did not leave the Bulgarian delegates who came to St. Petersburg after the Prince's election in any doubt. "Take your Prince from my hands," he said, "and love him as I love him." On certain points, the Prince, young and inexperienced as he was, was under no illusions. He realised that the separation of the Bulgarian people into three distinct categories was unnatural and could not last. At an early date he characterised the Treaty of Berlin as "that monstrous monument of European diplomatic ignorance." Count Andrassy, the Austro-Hungarian Foreign Minister, advised him "to respect the Treaty as long as he could manage to do so," and Lord Beaconsfield himself remarked to the Empress Frederick that "the business without Eastern Rumelia would not last more than seven years." Again, as all the wisest of Balkan and Southern Slav statesmen have done, the Prince soon came to realise that the best hope for the Balkans lay in confederation rather than in mutual rivalry. From the outset, too, the Prince looked on the Constitution as unsuitable—senseless, he called it—for a new state. Almost his first difficulties with Russia arose from the Tsar's unwillingness to allow any modifications in the form of the Constitution. After the death of his aunt, the Tsaritsa, and after the murder, in 1881, of Tsar Alexander II., the Prince lost all personal support and encouragement from the Russian Court. The fact that he had sanctioned the construction of the Caribrod-Vakerel railway, in preference to the line Svištov-Trnovo-Sofia which had been proposed by Russia, had already given offence, and it is said that Alexander III. had bitterly resented Prince Alexander's criticism of the Russian Army at the end of the Russo-Turkish war, and that he was jealous of his father's affection for him. Be this as it may, it is certain that the Tsar's hostility towards the Prince increased so violently that, in the end, his emissaries, in their efforts to get rid of him from Bulgaria, only stopped

short of actual murder. The Prince complained that, among all the Russian officials in Bulgaria, there was only one whom he could trust; the officers treated him with open insolence, and made it clear that to be in disgrace with him was the surest recommendation for promotion in Russia. With the people at large, the Russians quickly lost the popularity they had gained during the war: they did not conceal their contempt for the unlettered peasants and kept all the best billets for themselves; the officers attended debates in the Sobranje and shouted down speakers whom they did not like. The Prince, after a few years, spoke of the "burning hatred" of his people against their Russian masters. But however strong may have been in those days the resentment against Russian interference, Bulgarian sympathy with the Russian people—as distinct from Russian politicians and officials—has never died, and at the present time this feeling of kinship between the two peoples constitutes one of the chief assets of the Bolshevik propaganda which is being carried on from Moscow in Bulgaria.

The Bulgars themselves were not easy to work with. The Bulgarian Revolutionary Committee which had had its headquarters at Bucarest, had claimed the functions of a provisional Government after the Treaty of San Stefano, but the Powers had paid small heed to these pretensions. Some of the Bulgars had had previous experience in minor public offices under the Turks, many had had an excellent education in Constantinople or in Russia or elsewhere abroad, and some had been schoolmasters, and the leadership in the Sobranje quite naturally fell into the hands of the more educated members. Politicians in Bulgaria, it should be noted, have, until the advent to power in 1919 of the present Agrarian Government, always been men of the towns as opposed to peasants. Bulgars are as a rule fluent speakers, and they took to debate and to party politics with a zest which did not always stop short at words. At first, parties were, broadly speaking, divided into Russophobe and Russophil—they have since become almost as numerous and as difficult to distinguish as parties are in this country—but it cannot be said that the same statesmen remained consistently in one party throughout the whole of their career. Three men, Cankov, Karavelov and Stambulov, stand out conspicuously among the politicians of the first two decades of this period of Bulgarian history. Cankov, who had been an official under the Turks, was reputed to have a talent for intrigue and to be able but unreliable, and an opportunist; Karavelov, a schoolmaster, who

had been educated in Russia and had studied philosophy, was a doctrinaire rather than a man of action; he was looked upon as incorruptible and it should be noted that both he and Cankov died in poverty. Both Cankov and Karavelov were as a rule pro-Russian; the former told Mr. Bourchier many years later that, in his opinion, Russia ought to have taken Bulgaria more seriously in hand from the first. Stambulov, the most notable part of whose career lies beyond the limits of Prince Alexander's reign, was perhaps the most remarkable man of a peculiarly Bulgarian type as yet produced by his country. Unscrupulous, extremely cruel and tyrannical as he undoubtedly was, Stambulov, with his ability, obstinacy and courage, was destined for ten years to hold his own against the intrigues of Russia and to complete the work which Prince Alexander had begun, and to die a terrible death at the hands of hired assassins in 1895. That the Prince found the internal situation difficult enough, is proved by the fact that within two years he had tried to work with seven different Cabinets—sometimes with Conservatives and sometimes with Liberals—and two Sobranjes. In his letters he speaks of the politicians as unscrupulous, and of the officials as "corrupt from the highest down to the last *gendarme*," but he draws a definite distinction between the officials and the peasants. "The Bulgarian people," he writes, "is good, honest and industrious." A good deal has been said lately in the newspapers about Communism and Bolshevism in Bulgaria. It is hard to see what the peasants, three-fourths of whom are already peasant proprietors, would stand to gain by dividing up each other's land. The general tendency is all against any violent upheaval. In addition to the characteristics of the Bulgar—his industry, his sobriety, his strength of purpose, his obstinacy—no trait is more marked than his intense attachment to his own village and to his own holding.

In May, 1881, the chaos in the country had become so dangerous that the Prince decided to take the Government into his own hands; with the Tsar's approval, he suspended the Constitution, made the Russian General Ehrenroth Prime Minister and obtained the assent of a packed Sobranje to a seven years' period of absolute rule. Prince Alexander, or his Russian and Bulgarian advisers, certainly had a short way of managing elections; the Constitution, which provided for manhood suffrage, secret ballot and all approved methods, was openly set at nought; Opposition voters or candidates were thrown into prison or hounded out of the country, until the elections were over. The

Sopadžis or Cudgellers, who were employed to belabour all supporters of the Opposition with their clubs, were a recognised institution, indeed practically government officials, until very recent times. Such conditions were, no doubt, tolerated because each party in turn hoped to profit by them. It is a matter of great concern that, at the present moment, a number of Bulgarian ex-Ministers are in prison and soon to be tried for their lives, but it must be remembered that, if, later on, these men return to power, they will probably deal in exactly the same way with the present holders of office. Byzantine traditions die hard, and it can hardly be too much emphasised that the Bulgars have been trained in two bad schools of politics—Turkish and Russian.

The Prince, however, was soon to find that a so-called autocracy was no solution of his difficulty. The Tsar recalled Ehrenroth because the Prince liked him, and sent in his place two Generals, Sobolev and Kaulbars. Two years under their espionage and tyranny and the general anarchy to which the country was reduced, convinced the Prince that he must make an end of Russian interference and that his only policy must be "Bulgaria for the Bulgars." Cankov and the Liberal Party, whose indignation had known no bounds when, two years before, the Prince had suspended the constitution, now consented to join a Coalition Government provided that the Constitution were restored. The Russian Generals, after an undignified attempt to kidnap the Prince, departed, and it was evident that the Prince had finally burnt his boats as regards Russia.

Throughout his reign the Prince made every effort to gain the support, or at all events to obtain the advice, of the representatives of the Great Powers. He undertook many painful pilgrimages to St. Petersburg and to Berlin and to Vienna, and always with the same result. Bismarck, the main object of whose policy was, at this time, to preserve friendship with Russia, was specially cruel in his treatment of the "Battenberger" as he called him; he could scarcely find words to express the depth of his indifference to all that might happen in Bulgaria. His attitude had not altered since the Congress of Berlin, when he observed: "Gentlemen, we are assembled not to secure the happiness of Bulgaria, but the peace of Europe." The Emperor William I., when the Prince, in despair, spoke of abdication, replied: "Well, then, go by all means; that won't upset me." The situation became yet more difficult when, in 1883, Prince Alexander and Princess Victoria, the Crown Prince of Prussia's

daughter, fell in love with each other. The attachment was warmly, even enthusiastically, encouraged by the Crown Princess and by Queen Victoria; it was uncompromisingly and even brutally opposed by the old Emperor, by the Princess's brother, later William II., and by Bismarck himself. The vicissitudes of the affair were canvassed by the whole of Europe during the four years it lasted, and this denial of personal happiness to the Prince was not the least of his sorrows.

The inevitable crisis in Eastern Rumelia came within the period prophesied by Lord Beaconsfield. Ever since the day when the Treaty of Berlin decreed the separation of the Bulgars of Eastern Rumelia from those of Free Bulgaria, the Bulgars who had been left under Turkish rule—prompted sometimes, no doubt, by Russian agitation—had not ceased to petition for reunion with their kinsmen. They had, however, gained the right, under the Treaty, to a considerable degree of self-government and the hand of the Turks had not borne heavily on them. The two Christian Governors who had in turn ruled over the Province had both been chosen by the Porte on account of their sympathy with the Bulgars. Aleko Pasha was the son of their great protector, Prince Bogoridi, and Gavril Pasha Krstovič had himself taken a leading part in the Exarchate movement. On 18 September, 1885, a bloodless revolution took place in Philippopolis; the Turkish Governor-General, Gavril Pasha, was quietly placed in his carriage with the horses' heads turned towards the Turkish frontier, and the union of the two Bulgarias under Prince Alexander was proclaimed by Bulgarian officers. It may well be asked why the British Government had apparently taken no heed of the machinations of Russia in Bulgaria, when, in 1877, the approach of the Russian Army to Constantinople had brought both countries to the brink of war. Mr. Gladstone, however, who came into office in 1880, retained much of his old sympathy for Russia as the Christian Power who had driven out the unbeliever, and, on the other hand, as Ambassador at Constantinople, we had Sir William White, who understood that the Bulgars would carry out the policy which was to our interest without our taking direct steps ourselves. The Prince had always foreseen that the union must take place, and he had received warnings that the crisis was imminent. He now ascertained, as best he could, what public opinion was in the country, and then deliberately placed himself, certainly with the cognizance of Karavelov, then Prime Minister, at the head of the movement. He could not do otherwise. Stambulov, indeed, told him that

two roads lay before him, "the one to Philippopolis and as much further as God may lead, the other to the Danube and to Darmstadt." His reception in Philippopolis was most enthusiastic and, when he visited the Mosque and promised the Moslems his personal protection, it was evident that all the inhabitants of the country were with him.

The news of the Union produced a considerable commotion in Europe, for it was a direct breach of the Treaty; but its effect on the Powers was contrary to all anticipations. The Porte, from which the Bulgars expected a declaration of war, was unable or unwilling to resent their action and confined itself to a protest. Russia, the Power which had in 1876-77 strained every nerve to create a far greater Bulgaria, in spite of the Prince's appeal for support for his people in the realisation of their national ideal, denounced the union and immediately recalled all Russian officers from the Bulgarian armies, and soon after removed Prince Alexander's name from the Russian Army List. Great Britain, acting on the advice of Sir William White, one of the wisest Ambassadors she has ever had at Constantinople, firmly supported the Prince and the Union, for by this time it was realised that a strong Bulgaria would mean, not a dangerous Russian outpost, but a powerful buffer against Russia. Bulgaria's neighbours, however, were alarmed at the change of the balance of power in the Balkans. Greece mobilised, but was restrained by the Powers from taking action. King Milan of Serbia, who a few months before had been writing the very indiscreet and very amusing letters to Prince Alexander which are quoted in Corti's book, used an insignificant frontier question as a pretext and, on November 14, declared war on Bulgaria. Austrian influence was strong at this time in Serbia, and there is no doubt the declaration of war was prompted by Austria.

It was an extremely difficult moment for the country. The Union of the two Bulgarias was barely two months old and the process of reorganisation was not complete. The recall of the Russian General who had acted as War Minister, and of the 230 Russian officers, had left the Bulgarian Army with hardly an officer above the rank of captain. Most of the troops were in Eastern Rumelia, where a Turkish attack was expected, and the nearest point of the railway was 120 kilometres from the Serbian frontier. But national enthusiasm was aroused; the peasants, including many Turks and Macedonians, came at once to the colours, two men often riding one horse; transport was improvised from country carts; by means of forced marches,

reinforcements began to reach the troops in the Slivnica lines three days after fighting had begun. Those first days had been extremely critical; the Bulgars had at first been outnumbered, and had retreated before the Serbs; heavy fogs had descended on the mountains and some of the troops had lost their way; Sofia itself was threatened. But under the personal command of Prince Alexander, who was now in his element, the Bulgars, with the reinforcements from East Rumelia, drove the Serbs back through the Dragoman Pass, recaptured Caribrod, crossed the frontier and took Pirot within a fortnight of the declaration of war. An advance on Niš and Belgrade seemed possible, for the Army was full of enthusiasm and confidence, but on November 27, Count Khevenhüller, the Austro-Hungarian diplomatic representative at Belgrade, who a fortnight before had incited King Milan to make war, met the Prince with the warning that, if he advanced further, he would find himself face to face with Austrian troops who were at the moment ready to enter Serbia. There was nothing for it but to acquiesce. Bulgaria derived no advantage from her victories at the Treaty of Bucarest, which was signed in March, 1886. Serbian and Bulgarian casualties were almost equal and each country paid the cost of her own campaign. The Bulgarian success was due in part to the Prince's leadership and to his wise choice of officers, and in part to the enthusiasm of the troops and to their six years' training under Russian officers. The Serbian campaign brought Bulgaria great prestige and, when the Sultan solved the Eastern Rumelian question by appointing the Prince Governor-General of the Province for five years, Russia alone was found to oppose the decision. Never had the situation seemed more auspicious; the Bulgars north of the Rhodope were at last united, the Prince was at the height of his popularity after his successful campaign. The Tsar, however, was only the more incensed by his triumph, and his downfall was decreed. An attempt by a Russian officer to kidnap or murder him had failed, but Russian agents found willing tools among some of the Bulgarian officers who were dissatisfied with their promotion after the late war. On August 21, 1886, less than a year after the Slivnica campaign, the Struma Regiment was induced, probably on false pretences, to disarm some loyal troops and to surround the Palace during the night. A party of cadets, many of whom were intoxicated, burst into the Prince's room and forced him to sign his abdication. He was driven to a port on the Danube and his own yacht conveyed him to Russian territory. The conspiracy was not the

work of military discontents alone; Cankov and his party had never forgiven the Prince for his suspension of the Constitution, and it was Cankov who, with Karavelov and the Metropolitan Clement, formed at once the Provisional Government. But, as soon as the news of the abdication spread, a storm of protest arose. Within a few hours of his departure, telegrams from the Army and from all parts of the country and, not least important, from Stambulov who, with Karavelov, had assumed the Regency, were sent to the Prince entreating him to return. He yielded and within ten days of his abdication he was again in Bulgaria. At each stage of his drive to Sofia a great concourse of peasants was waiting to welcome him back. But he had already taken a false step; from Ruščuk, at the instigation of the Russian Consul there, he had telegraphed to the Tsar, saying that even now he was willing to return his crown to Russia, from whom he had received it, if it were best for his country. The Tsar replied coldly that he could not approve the Prince's return and that he must refrain from all further intervention in the sad state of affairs to which the country had been reduced. To those who saw him in Sofia the Prince seemed a changed man. The long strain of fighting intrigue at home and abroad, the poisonous atmosphere with which the scurrilous Cankovist press had surrounded him, the treachery of some of his own officers and Ministers, together with the indignities and sleeplessness of the last few days and nights, had broken his spirit and he felt he could no longer sustain the conflict with Russia. He took his leave of Bulgaria with these words: "Having become convinced of the painful truth that my departure from Bulgaria will facilitate the re-establishment of good relations between Bulgaria and Russia, and having received from Russia the assurance that the independence, freedom and rights of our State shall remain intact, I declare to my much loved people that I have renounced the Bulgarian throne." A British eyewitness told me that he saw the Prince leaving Sofia with his face set like a stone. A long train of mourning peasants went with him on his journey to Vidin.

There is an epilogue to the tragedy of Prince Alexander's life. Some time after it had become perfectly clear that his projected marriage with Princess Victoria of Prussia could never take place, he married an actress of the Darmstadt Court Theatre, with whom he spent five years in peaceful retirement under the title of Count Hartenau. He died suddenly at Graz in 1893, and was buried at Sofia with royal honours and deep mourning.

The Prince was probably right in deciding to leave Bulgaria. The Russian Government looked on him as the incarnation of Bulgarian ingratitude and as the main obstacle in the way of Pan-Slav designs. He realised that, although he had the support of Stambulov, who was already the strongest man in the country and of the majority of the people, Bulgaria would have no peace with Russia while he remained, and he resigned in what he thought the best interest of his adopted country. His reign was no failure, though it had ended in his abdication. He had throughout helped to stimulate national consciousness among the Bulgars; he had fought a victorious war, which had placed the new State on an equality with her Balkan neighbours; he had, at the cost of his own throne, refused to allow Bulgaria to become a dependency of Russia. The people themselves, over whose heads this game of high politics had been played, showed, for the most part, the calm indifference of the peasant to politics and politicians. Three-fourths of the population were agriculturists, and it was enough for them that they could cultivate their land under better conditions. Each village had its church, schools had multiplied, communications had improved, a railway had been built, the Treasury was not empty, and the Turks were no longer their masters.

ELLINOR F. B. GROGAN.

LABOUR CONDITIONS IN MODERN POLAND.

THE conditions under which industrial life went on in Poland before the outbreak of the war—and, indeed, down to the end of 1918—were known only very imperfectly to the British public. The political situation was tolerably clear: the people of Poland were divided into three parts, and each part held in a more or less arbitrary fashion by the three great empires of Russia, Austria, and Germany. It was realised also that some of the most important of the Continental industrial areas that had been springing up so rapidly during the half-century before the War lay in the Polish provinces; but of the life of the inhabitants of these areas, the life of the working men and working women, almost nothing was known.

A century ago industry in Poland was almost entirely confined to the villages. Spinning and weaving were carried on in the cottages over a wide area, but the product was for local consumption; coal was not much mined and little used. Even by 1850 the change was very slight, and, in fact, the great increase of industrial activity dates from about 1870. Łódź, with a population at the present time of over half a million inhabitants, was a village of eight hundred inhabitants in 1820; by 1855 they numbered only 4,000. The largest industrial areas were in Russian Poland; next in importance came those in the Polish part of Upper Silesia under German rule, whilst there was also the more scattered region of the oilfields in Austrian Poland.

Under these three Governments the conditions of industrial life differed widely. Russian Poland was the worst governed and worst administered of the three. German Poland shared the highly-developed system that had been established throughout the German Empire, but, owing to political antagonism, the whole social administration was entirely out of sympathy with the workers themselves. Austria tended to follow in the wake of Germany, but the organisation in Galicia (Austrian Poland) though less complete, was less bureaucratically rigid, and less actuated by national hostility to the Poles themselves, than was the case in Germany.

In Galicia and in Russian Poland the enfranchisement of the

serfs was not carried out until 1848 and 1863. This fact had a great influence on the industrial history of the country. It was immediately afterwards that the great burst of industrial development in Poland took place. The enfranchised peasants crowded to the towns, to be drawn into the vortex of the industrial revolution that was beginning to transform those areas. Far from assisting to deal with the problems that thus suddenly arose, the Russian authorities seemed to be bent on raising obstacles to the proper accommodation of the workers in the new urban areas, and it is known that they tried to make use of the occasion to foster discord between the propertied classes and their new employees. Not only was the Russian Administration notoriously backward in making any sort of effort to improve the lot of the poorer classes or to raise the standard of life, but the very laws which they imposed rendered any voluntary effort on the part of the workers, employers, or of the two in concert, illegal and punishable as a political crime.

The suppression of Polish schools was a well-known part of the Russian programme; but the conditions of industrial life at this time are best illustrated by the laws in force against trade unions. Down to 1906 all combinations of workmen for improvement of industrial conditions, for securing a reasonable standard of life, or for any other purpose were forbidden under the most savage penalties. Strikes, even of the most orderly possible character, were followed up by police arrests, and transportation of the convicted to distant parts of Russia. This state of things continued without any sort of alleviation until the revolution of 1905. In that year the pent-up feelings of the down-trodden classes broke out in concert with revolts in various parts of Russia itself. The Government, in its alarm, passed a new law permitting the existence of trade unions, but subjecting them in practice to the perpetual control of the Russian Minister of the Interior and his creatures—the police. No sooner had the political situation settled down and the revolts been suppressed, than this police control began to be used to hamper and stifle the trade union movement at every point; so much was this the case that many of the unions preferred to carry on in clandestine fashion, as they had done before the new law was in force. In other cases the unions found their sphere of activities curtailed in every possible way; and in course of time a large number were suppressed by the authorities for alleged infractions of the law. In this way, by one means or another, the whole of the trade union movement found itself in sympathy to the full with the

ever-increasing indignation and resentment against the oppressive and almost barbarous conditions of the old *régime*.

In the Polish provinces under German rule, though the unions were no longer prohibited by law after 1869, unions containing a large proportion of Polish workers were subject to constant persecution on the part of the authorities on the grounds that they were organised for political purposes. Use of the Polish language was forbidden at any of the meetings of the union except under police supervision. In Austria, the law was much of the same character; the discrimination against the Polish language was not in force, but every endeavour was made to strain the law to prevent payment of members from union funds during strikes. Police interference was at all times an unceasing obstacle, in the Polish provinces as in all the other Slav provinces of the Austrian Empire.

The same policy of the Russian bureaucracy that so eagerly suppressed every endeavour of the Polish workpeople to help themselves, rendered the administration exceedingly backward—not to say indifferent—in taking any measures for the social welfare of those they governed. Certain regulations were in force for the safety of workers in the larger factories and mines, but they remained a dead letter except in so far as the employers took action themselves in agreement with their working compatriots. Inspectors were few, hostile to the Polish workpeople, and always easily bribed. In Germany there existed an obligatory system of insurance, entirely regulated and controlled by the State, guaranteeing relief to the worker in case of sickness, accident, or inability to work for any other cause, including old age. Russia had no system of insurance, though the law laid down the principle of the liability of the employer, in certain of the more important industries, in case of accident.

All local government in the German and Russian provinces was in the hands of officials, German or Russian. Only in Austrian Poland were the Poles allowed even the most elementary responsibility. The Russian authorities, moreover, omitted to take any steps for the health and welfare of the towns and villages. They not only ignored their duties as regards roads, water, lighting, building and drainage, but actually forbade the collection of funds for supplying the most necessary services of a public and social nature. It is scarcely a matter for wonder that the towns of the Russian provinces bore a neglected appearance.

The war had a most profound influence on the industrial

life of Poland. With the exception of two German provinces, there is not a district that has not been swept by the armies of one side or another. In Galicia vast areas have been totally destroyed, as in France or Belgium. Elsewhere all possible factory equipment and plant was torn out and destroyed by the Russians or the Germans. The German Army leaders had instructions to destroy all possible means by which the industrial areas of Poland might become Germany's industrial competitors after the War. The only occupations that thrived at this unhappy time were the manufacture of munitions of war and agriculture. Under the German occupation Poland was set the task of supplying the armies with war materials and food. As raw materials began to grow scarce, however, unemployment rapidly increased. By 1918 only a small fraction of the urban population could find employment. A terrible hunger began. The shortage of provisions, the presence of the Army in the country, and the continual fresh issues of depreciated paper currency on the part of the German authorities drove up prices to an unprecedented height. The price of bread rose thirty times between 1914 and 1918, the price of meat twelve times, whilst the resistance of the military government to the constant demands for increase of wages on the part of those who were fortunate enough to get work reduced the bulk of the population to actual starvation.

The weakening of the military rule in Germany at the beginning of November, 1918, led to revolutionary movement, as immediate as it was spontaneous, throughout the country. It was a revolt at once economic and political. In the South the industrial leaders headed the political revolt, and it was on this wave of enthusiasm that the new independent Polish Government was hastily formed in Warsaw. It included some of the elements of the Warsaw Council of Regency, the provisional government that had been administering civil affairs under the control of the German authorities. Associated with them from the first were the workers' leaders. The country was, however, practically in a state of siege. Food was so short that one of the very first efforts of the Administration was to get credit to purchase food-stuffs abroad. Unemployment actually increased in consequence of the sudden stoppage of the munitions factories. The volunteer Army absorbed a number temporarily, but it was difficult enough to provide for the troops and much more so to feed those left at home.

The burden of the work fell upon the new Departments of

Labour and Food Supply. The former more particularly dealt with the situation of the workers. There had been a Department of Labour in the provisional administration under the German occupation, but its activities were very limited. During the days of the occupation, however, plans were laid that were to prove of great value in the sudden activity after November, 1918.

The question of unemployment was the first to be attacked by the new Ministry. As early as December of 1918 Registration of the unemployed was commenced ; and a number of employment exchanges were set up all over the country. By July, 1919, the number of unemployed on the books reached its maximum—a little over 450,000, out of a population at that time of about twenty-five millions. How was the demand for work to be met ? The country was in ruins, and the Ministry turned at once its attention to the question of rebuilding. Some of the tasks taken on with the least delay were : railway repairs and the alteration of some of the lines from broad to normal gauge, repairing of bridges, road-building, the work of rendering the rivers navigable once more, demolition of military works, repairing the buildings and streets of the towns, and cutting timber in the forests. Whilst employment on these public works was organised every effort was made to take advantage of the offers of employment that reached the labour exchanges from private industrial concerns. In January, 1919, however, before these works could be commenced on a large scale, it became essential to issue relief in money or in food to the many thousands of needy and workless in the towns. Local committees were set up all over the country to administer the relief ; at one time over 250,000 persons were drawing assistance in this way. The state of employment actually began to improve from the month of June, 1919 ; improvement at first was slow, but there has never been a very serious relapse of long duration. The number of registered workers out of employment since July, 1919, has been as follows :—

July, 1919	453,400
January, 1920	222,300
July, 1920	56,100
January, 1921	49,900
July, 1921	55,600
January, 1922	56,300
July, 1922	42,400
January, 1923	40,000 (approximately).

At the time when the struggle with unemployment was at its

height, the food problem was one of the greatest difficulty for the whole country. In peace time the Polish lands produce more than the grain, meat, milk, vegetables and other commodities required to feed their whole population (now 28 millions approximately). The winter of 1918 to 1919, however, found the country terribly denuded—partly by the recent demands of the Army of Occupation, partly on account of the decreased area under cultivation. Grain and other foodstuffs had therefore to be imported from abroad, largely from America, and the cost—though the Polish mark was still only at the very commencement of its depreciation—was enormous. Rations of flour, fats, potatoes, salt, soap and burning-oil were issued free to the workless poor, and sold at a low price even to those who were drawing wages and salaries. Much good work was done by relief societies, many of them financed entirely by British or American funds, or by the money of other foreign countries; but naturally the Polish Government bore a vast proportion of the burden, and these transactions were an enormous drain on the resources of the State, and justified only by the extreme urgency of the situation. Corn had to be purchased by the Government again in 1920, and prices of foodstuffs were controlled right down to 1921. But by that time the situation had changed, and the greatest danger was not so much shortage of food and lack of employment as the difficulty of adjusting wages to the ever rising prices resulting from the constantly falling value of the Polish paper mark.

At the present time the number of workpeople in industrial enterprises of all kind is a little less than one million. Before the War, the number was nearly 1,300,000. During the War and subsequently there was a marked return from the towns to the country. The number of wage-earners in agriculture and rural industries is now over 1,100,000—not including the very much larger population of peasant proprietors. From the first the workers had able and active leaders who have had very great influence on the course of action of the Government from the outset. Naturally enough, many of the first measures of the new Government were on the lines of reversing the regulations and methods of the old *régime*. The trade unions, freed from the repressive measures of the Russian police and the German military authorities, and no longer driven to hold their meetings in secret, came into the open at once. Their numbers increased with the development of their activities, and they played a large part in directing and administering the new arrangements under

which the labour exchanges were organised and a general scheme of social insurance and relief in cases of distress was established. At the beginning of 1919 a law was passed giving a formal legal standing to the unions. Societies are registered at the offices of the Inspectorate of Labour, a department of the Ministry of Labour. Registered societies have all legal rights, can enter into contracts, can sue and be sued, hold real property, receive legacies, make collective agreements, and so forth. The regulations of the union have legal binding force on its members. Further, the unions send delegates to the central advisory bodies attached to the Ministry of Labour.

One of the speediest of the victories of the workers in Poland under the new *régime* was the decree of the eight-hour day. This decree was issued by the new Government on 23 November, 1918, only a few days after the establishment of the Republic. It applies to all industrial establishments, mines, railways and commercial businesses. The regulation week of forty-six hours is adhered to throughout the whole country. Overtime is permitted in certain specified eventualities, subject to special regulations as to remuneration.

The part played by the labour exchanges in the early months of the new State has been referred to already. The bureaux were at first organised by the Ministry of Labour as occasion arose to fulfil their part in dealing with the crisis of unemployment and industrial unsettlement after the War. The regular ordering of the system was developed later. The legal basis came in January, 1920, when a law was passed sanctioning and codifying the organisation and the procedure which had been established up to that date. Under that law ninety main bureaux or exchanges have been set up, each working over a particular area. The central office is with the Ministry of Labour in Warsaw. Their activities are threefold: First, to bring together offers of employment and applications for employment in each district; secondly, through the Central Office, to exchange the supply and demands of work in their respective districts with the needs of other districts; thirdly, the acceptance of applications for employment abroad—these also are passed through the Central Office. This last duty is a remarkable one, and reminds us that Poland is a country which still sends out its workpeople in large numbers to other countries. Here is a most important field for the activity of the State in protecting its citizens by a process of collective bargaining on a large scale from the exploitation of a distant and comparatively unknown

labour market, thus offering protection from one of the worst evils from which the Polish poorer classes suffered before the War. An important feature in this system is the part played by delegates of the workers in the practical work of the bureaux and in the direction of policy in the Ministry of Labour itself. This influence is exercised through the councils or bodies of delegates that sit permanently both at the local bureaux and at the Central Office in Warsaw.

In addition to the State labour exchanges there are the so-called co-operative bureaux. These are for the most part the direct organisations of the unions. The Ministry of Labour keeps touch and endeavours to ensure co-operation between the State and the co-operative bureaux and other existing organisations of workers or employers with the object of centralising the work as far as possible. The following table, showing the number of places actually filled in different months since 1919, indicates the recent activity of the State employment bureaux :—

July, 1919	52,000
January, 1920	4,000
August, 1920	16,000
January, 1921	16,900
July, 1921	17,200
January, 1922	10,800
June, 1922	12,300
August, 1922	14,900

In Russian Poland before the War, and in Austrian Poland to a lesser extent, the regulations for securing the protection of the worker either as regards his wage contract, or his health and safety in his employment were very nearly valueless. There were in both countries definite limitations as regards children's labour; but in Russian Poland the regulations regarding safety in mines and factories were entirely insufficient. In German Poland, on the other hand, the protection afforded to the worker was tolerably complete, and a minute and careful regulation characterised the whole of industrial life. The whole system was probably too bureaucratic, and in any case suffered from a certain spirit of distrust of the workers themselves; but as regards its actual application in German Poland it was only too often used as a powerful instrument in the hands of officials who were intent, above all things, on "Germanisation" and the extermination of any relic of Polish as distinct from German feeling among any part of the citizens of the German Empire.

It was as early as 3 January, 1919, that a decree of the Polish Government set up a scheme of factory and mine inspection. The Russian and Austrian systems had been particularly unsatisfactory because even such regulations as were in existence could not be enforced owing to the lack of adequate machinery. The inspectors under the scheme as it is developed to-day visit industrial establishments of every sort, and take up all questions regarding the safety of the workers, accidents, and breaches of wage contracts; they also have power to settle disputes of a minor character. In the course of between four and five thousand official visitations in 1921 there were brought to light over sixteen thousand infractions of the regulations. Owing to the rapid rise in the cost of living, the inspectors are also much occupied in negotiating collective agreements for the settlement of the difficult problem of regulating rates of wages. An agreement for the whole textile industry in September last, and a similar agreement for the Warsaw metal trade in July, are examples of the work they have done in this direction. In both these cases, and in many others, the wages have now been fixed according to a definite scale varying with the cost of living. There is no law at present providing for compulsory arbitration in disputes except in the one important case of agricultural workers and one other form of employment of lesser interest. In practice, however, the inspectors are very frequently requested to arbitrate in cases of disputes of all kinds, and in cases of great importance the Ministry of Labour is now regularly called in to act as mediator.

In the important realm of social insurance, Germany was, before the War, ahead of all other countries of the World. The elaborate system of insurance covered sickness, accident, old age, widowhood, etc. In Austria for twenty-five years before the War a system of insurance against sickness and accident was in force. Russian Poland presented a great contrast to the position in Germany: no such scheme had ever been applied there. A law passed by the Russian Duma in 1912 was never in force in Poland; the employer was merely held liable in case of accidents.

To remedy the deficiency of the Russian law a project of compulsory insurance against sickness was worked out in Warsaw during the last days of the German occupation, but nothing could be put into practice till after the establishment of the new Government. It was by a very early decree—in the month of January, 1919—that the new scheme acquired its first binding

force. Local insurance offices are now distributed throughout the country with an office in each of the principal industrial centres. The control of all local insurance matters lies with local Consultative Committees, which work in conjunction with each of these offices. Two-thirds of the members of these Committees are elected by the insured persons. The Committee selects and appoints the executive staff, and also a local Arbitration Tribunal whose duty it is to decide cases of particular doubt or difficulty. The general control is vested in the Ministry of Labour. The benefits include free medical attendance as well as subsistence, together with allowances up to sixty per cent. of normal wages. All these payments are made to vary in accordance with the changes in the cost of living from month to month. With regard to accident insurance, the work of extending over the three parts of Poland a system similar to that existing in German Poland is in progress, but is not yet completed. Old age pensions were paid in German Poland before the War, but not in Austrian or Russian Poland; the new Government has not yet been able to extend the scheme to the Austrian and Russian provinces.

In describing labour conditions in modern Poland, it would be difficult to overestimate the importance of the problem of the regulation of wages in conformity with the constantly increasing cost of living. The point has already been mentioned in connection with the work of the labour inspectors. The rise in the cost of living in Poland is to be attributed—at any rate since 1920—to the constant depreciation of the Polish bank-note, the paper currency of the country. The causes of this depreciation concern financial, rather than social, history, but the continual fall in the value of the currency has given rise to a very difficult social problem. The average daily cost of living in marks for a family of four persons—two adults and two children—living in Warsaw, was at the end of December well over twenty times what it was two years ago, as the following figures show:—

December, 1920	358
July, 1921	823
January, 1922	1,500
July, 1922	2,522
October, 1922	4,109
December, 1922	7,390

Here, of course, there is no question of wages remaining stationary. Wages must rise—and rise rapidly; but the

question has been—how rapidly, and what machinery can be devised for regulating them?

This work in Poland is undertaken by the Central Statistical Department in conjunction with the Ministry of Labour. In Warsaw and in several provincial cities committees have been set up for the express purpose of studying the cost of living from day to day. It is by these committees that the cost of the daily budget of a family of four people is worked out. The committees are composed of representatives of the Government, the trade unions, and employers and business men. Each month the figures calculated by the committees are published both in the daily press and in Government publications, and these figures are used everywhere throughout Poland as the basis on which standard rates of wages are fixed. The figures do not have binding force on either side, but in very many industries it is accepted that wages are raised automatically in accordance with the cost of living as fixed by the committees. The following figures show the variations of wages and the official cost of living figures for 1921 and 1922 :—

	Daily Wage of a Qualified Workman in Metal Trade.	Daily Wage of a Bricklayer.	Daily Cost of Living of Family of Four.
	Marks.	Marks.	Marks.
January, 1921	470	592	450
April, 1921	716	868	552
July, 1921	859	984	823
October, 1921	1,631	1,920	1,557
January, 1922	1,631	2,260	1,500
April, 1922	2,022	2,520	1,076
July, 1922	2,910	3,296	2,521
October, 1922	4,604	6,800	4,109

The central Statistical Department and the Ministry of Labour also chronicle all industrial disputes of any importance. On the whole, it must be admitted that both sides have hitherto shown themselves desirous of avoiding prolonged struggles. Strikes are certainly not infrequent, and in view of the amazingly unsteady financial conditions this is not surprising, but they are very seldom of long duration. In the six months, January to June, 1922, forty-one strikes in the mining, mineral and metal industries were recorded officially by the Ministry of Labour;

eight lasted one week or more, and of these only three continued as long as a fortnight.

In the first four years of her history as a new state Poland has been remarkably free from serious industrial disturbances. The workers have been advancing at every point: they have succeeded in establishing an organisation securing, in full agreement with the employing community, the primary safeguards of social welfare, while they have also succeeded in securing a permanent place in the various departments of the new social organisation. Such were the conditions existing before the War, that a sweeping change of this character was a necessary and natural consequence of the revival of the Republic. Of obstinate opposition to this movement there has been none; it would have been useless, and indeed, fatal politically to the community. Not a little of the credit for the success of these changes is due to the policy and energetic action of the Ministry of Labour in Warsaw and its representatives, who have seized upon the fact that the depression, not to say the degradation, of the workers under the old political *régime* was one of the most pernicious and indictable results of the rule of Russia and Germany. The Department has worked in conjunction both with the workers and the employers to remedy the situation, and in the result—not merely in the actual measures that have become law, but in the broad and healthy principles by which they have been applied—they have performed something more than a mere experiment; they have laid the foundations of a strong and healthy social organisation in the Polish State.

J. H. PENSON.

THE PEASANT IN POLISH LITERATURE. (I.)

I.

THE problem of holding up a literary mirror to the life of the peasant in Poland meets with the same encouragements and the same difficulties as among other modern nations. But its solution—if there can be any solution at all—has been different. The reservation is essential; we are, indeed, dealing with a problem here which by its very nature is incapable of solution.

Both the encouragements and the difficulties had one common source: the influence of the classical literature of antiquity. The present writer has had occasion to affirm over and over again what he wishes once more to repeat here: that this antique influence, whatever short-sighted nationalism may think of it, has been, and will be, not a factor destructive of nationality, but, on the contrary, one which turns the attention of men to elements in their own national life analogous to the facts of antiquity. For this reason, a sincere and hospitable reception of antique culture is normally followed by a flourishing growth of national literature.

It was the dying world of antiquity which left us, as the most representative literary image of its peasant class, the type of the rural poem or idyll, in two distinct forms. Firstly, there was the idyll which was, in the broadest sense of the word, dramatic: this is exemplified, above all, by the idylls of Theocritus, better known in the modern world by their Latin re-handling in Virgil's *Eclogues*, and by that once famous and now almost quite forgotten romance, the *Daphnis and Chloë* of Longus. Secondly, we inherit from antiquity what I should call the didactic kind of idyll: this is represented by the old *Works and Days* of Hesiod, which are also better known by their Latin imitation in Virgil's *Georgics*. In this didactic kind of idyll, it is true, Man, as working on the soil, in the garden, or about the bee-hive, did not appear at all, or appeared only in his working, agricultural capacity; whereas in the other, the dramatic type, the daily work of the countryside is not a prominent feature, but serves rather as a background only for the inner life of the men who do it. And since this life, in order to unfold itself, requires some space, and it was not expedient

to block up this space by images of work, drawing the attention away from thoughts and feelings, it was accordingly found appropriate to choose for the heroes of dramatic idylls not the tillers of the soil, but those to whom the nature of their rural occupations gave most opportunity, and leisure, and actual encouragement for the free play of feelings—viz., shepherds. The reason given is not the only, but certainly the most obvious one for their prominence.

To all this, however, one circumstance more must be added to which the idyll of antiquity and the corresponding branch of modern poetical fiction, until quite recent times, owed (and partly owe even to-day) their peculiar colouring. It is a circumstance of high significance and determining importance for the development not only of our modern literature, but even—it can be asserted without exaggeration—of our political life.

The type of idyll above described (excepting, of course, old Hesiod, who never influenced modern literature directly) arose at a time of antagonism between *nature* and *nurture*. It was the time when the school of Antisthenes, that predecessor of Rousseau and Tolstoy, was branding all culture, and particularly town civilisation, as "idle smoke" (*typhos*), and proclaiming the return to simplicity and communion with nature, seeing in such life the condition and the realisation not only of true felicity, but of true virtue as well. Models of this were sought originally outside the pale of civilised life, in the wastes and forests of the North, among Scythians (and, in the case of Rome, among the savage Teutons). It was then that the idealisation of the "noble savage" began, which found its modern correlative in such products of eighteenth century sentimentalism as the once famous prose epic *Les Natchez* by Chateaubriand, preceded by numerous similar attempts from the English Mrs. Aphra Behn's *Oroonoko* to Voltaire's *L'Ingénu*, and followed by a countless literary posterity not quite extinct to this day. The pupils of Antisthenes—the so-called cynics—could not go nearer home for their models of natural simplicity, because Athens herself, civilised as she then was, had not yet become sufficiently differentiated from the country population around, to distinguish and idolise the peasants. Such times only came when Alexandrine Romanticism arose, deliberately closing its eyes to reality, proclaiming the return to a beautiful past, and accordingly to that ever-living past also which surrounds us all to-day, and which we call the countryside. To idealise country-life became the literary watchword of the antique idyll. It was in the charming seclusion of the country that the imaginary Daphnis and Chloë—the Paul and Virginia of

the antique world—grew up, and it was to rural purity and goodness that they returned after a short sojourn among the squalor and immorality of the town.

Such moods and views were bequeathed by antiquity to its numerous followers in the modern world.

II.

It was in this that there was contained not only the encouragement but also the difficulty which any attempt at literary reproduction of village life encountered in all modern Europe, and accordingly in Poland as well. Strange to say not even an intimate acquaintance with the real conditions of country life could prevent the poet from falsifying its image. A Polish country gentleman may well be supposed to have known his neighbours, the peasants, most thoroughly. Having dealings with them over such technical matters as the raising of crops or the breeding of cattle, he knew well enough that he had to do with men very remote indeed from the primitive and disinterested simplicity of Arcadian times; and yet when he took the pen in his hand, he willingly forsook the ground of a reality devoid of charm, and peopled the sands or meadows of a transformed country with the Philons or Daphnes of the classical idyll.

The eighteenth century was the hey-day of classicist idyllic poetry. Its last representative in the field of the "dramatic" idyll, Francis Karpiński—now forgotten, except for his popular Christmas carols and devout songs—was yet one of the favourite writers of Poland's greatest poet Mickiewicz, who even in the prime of his own new Romantic style in the nineteenth century was fain to seek inspiration for his poetry in the "strain of Philon," one of Karpiński's idyllic heroes.

The descriptive classicist idyll outlasted the dramatic type: it is represented in the very midst of nineteenth century Romanticism by one of the last Mohicans of the classical school, Cajetan Koźmian, who is unpleasantly memorable by his fierce opposition to the new Poland's greatest singer. When Mickiewicz, at home at first, abroad and in exile afterwards, was producing his epoch-making Romantic masterpieces, Koźmian and his fellow-sectarians, the die-hard classicists of Warsaw, were speaking (and writing) with contempt of the mad youngster who had forsworn the standard traditions of the Polish Versailles—the Court of Poland's last king. Mickiewicz was winning his battles by publishing Romantic ballads and romances, epic poems and

fantastic dreams one after another; Koźmian did not publish, but used to read out from MS. to a respectful but dwindling audience, his *Polish Georgics*: he was assured that this masterpiece, when published at last, would at once shatter the fame of his daring rival, built as it was on a strange misunderstanding of the true nature of poetry. But while he was waiting for the fullness of his own good time, the last moments of any disposition on the part of the Polish reading public to accept such poetry as his were inexorably slipping away, and when the *Georgics* were at last published in 1839—five years after the greatest work of the greatest new Polish poet—they were antiquated as soon as born, and met with universal indifference among a changed world.

And yet the work had its good qualities, which were out of the common. If only it had seen the light half a century earlier, the author's name would have its place of honour to-day by the side of the two most famous poets of the eighteenth century—Krasicki and Trembecki. True, Koźmian's *Georgics* cannot boast of much originality; Hesiod begat Virgil, Virgil begat Delille with his eighteenth century gardens, and Delille begat Koźmian. But what is this to us? These *Georgics* are *Polish Georgics* after all, though there is a classical glass before the poet's eye. Never mind—we read them. Well the soil, the garden, the bee-hive: all homely, genuine. True, classical reminiscences crop up at every step, but they are characteristic of the author's own inner world, which he brings with him; they do not affect the substance of his poem. However, there is a statuesque stiffness in it all. We see a great machinery before us, its working, its motion; we do not see the mainsprings which move it, we do not hear the noises of its life, everything seems to be going on soundlessly, as in the stillness of the under-world. All—even the holiday games of country lads and lasses; and yet we know from Sienkiewicz's seventeenth century hero that *apud Polonos sine strepitu et clamore gaudia non fiunt*—"that there is no joy in Poland without tumult and shouting." Here, we are transferred to an unduly tranquil and unusually ordered agricultural community; they take even their pleasures at the "harvest home" quietly and sedately.

"Blood stirs in the veins of the young, they join hands, each with the partner of his labours in the field; swift bounds and giddy whirls of dance begin, and songs and amorous rhymes resound between, such as were bandied between Maro's shepherds, or intoned by old Kochanowski among the villagers of his Black Wood. While the young are carried away on eddies of merri-

ment, fathers and mothers, at the festive board, discuss old times, the wars under Sobieski, the licence under the Saxon kings . . .”

The subject-matter of all this is, indeed, life itself; the verse is nobly dignified, the language lofty—all white marble as it were, not bespattered with the meanness of farmer’s work. It may please, even to admiration—for a time. But the farther we go, the more we feel, that the air of it, free from thick vapours and exhalations, is devoid of oxygen also—of the oxygen of *passion*. And it is to passion that the public has become accustomed, thanks to those innovators whom Koźmian and his followers vainly opposed all their life. Even twenty years before the *Georgics* appeared in print, a work was already in the hands of eager readers which gave room, to some extent at least, to that element of passion so utterly absent from the elegant pages of the Polish Virgil.

III.

The *dolce stil nuovo* which supplanted this cold Virgilianism was created, among others—as far as it can be said to have been actually created on Polish soil—by Casimir Brodziński, who, at any rate, was *pars magna* in the making of the new movement.

Being twenty years younger than Koźmian, he came forward long before him with a work which was truly epoch-making in the presentation of peasant themes in Polish verse. This chronological priority of Brodziński’s, however, has no essential importance; in spite of it, his idyll of *Wiesław* was a literary descendant of Koźmian’s *Georgics*; the order of their dates is one of those accidents in literary history which sometimes make older branches seem to sprout higher up the tree than younger ones.

We shall not call Brodziński a Romantic poet, since he did not himself wish to be called so. But his work—the only one of his which has remained on the surface of national memory—is a Romantic composition, flowing from that source of Romantic inspiration which we call sentimentalism. We have used the delusive word “Romantic,” which, in the view of many competent judges, has lost all right of citizenship if not in the history, at least in the theory of literature, because of the many illegitimate uses it has been put to. Not being a specialist in this domain myself, I beg to be allowed to express an opinion as to the proper use of the word.

The subjects of poetry may be things observed as well as things imagined; experience and creative phantasy have an equal share in poetical production. The decisive factor is the

condition of mind assumed by the author to exist in the men he represents. In this condition of mind the two possible extremes, or opposite poles, are : complete unconsciousness, and complete consciousness, with numberless links in between them. Leaving aside those links—important in practice but barren for theory—let us concentrate our attention on the poles.

There is a tendency in literature which presupposes in the persons represented a complete, or at least a predominant, consciousness of their thoughts, feelings, and actions; and that tendency is Classicism. The term must not be identified with any antique origin, though it is undeniable that the tendency prevails in antiquity, and constitutes its most characteristic and striking feature. In this—let us say in passing—the very educational force of antiquity resides; the education of man necessarily has for one of its principal aims the awakening of his self-consciousness, the Apollonian "Know thyself." This consciousness in itself does not at all exclude feeling, even passion. Passion may be self-conscious, as Euripides's *Medea* proves best; the heroine is fully conscious of the evil she is about to do, but passion has power over judgment—that passion (*thymos*) which is the cause of greatest evil to mortal men.

And there is, on the other side, a literary tendency which presupposes in the personages represented a complete or predominating unconsciousness of themselves, of their feelings and actions, a tendency which opposes to the Apollonian lucid surface of the human soul what I should call its dark Dionysian depth.

In themselves, these two opposite extremes have long been noticed by scholars, ever since Plato in one of the most significant passages of his *Republic* contrasted the Hellenes as representatives of intellectualism (*logistikón*), with the Northern and the Southern barbarians as the representatives, the former of unconscious valour (*thymoeides*), the latter of unconscious lust (*epithymetikon*). The Northern barbarians, being disciples of the Greeks, long looked at their own nature through the prism of Greek intellectualism; it was a prolonged Classical period under various names. Till finally, obeying the Apollonian watchword "Know thyself," they became conscious—paradoxical as this may seem—of their own elemental unconsciousness. Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, and, among recent thinkers, Oswald Spengler, the national prophet of defeated Germany, and certainly a thinker worthy of attention, though he often, like William James, only calls "old ways of thought" by "new

names"—these are the chief representatives of the antagonism. To mention some of his terms only, Spengler's new book calls the conflicting principles "vegetative existence" (*Da-Sein*) and "wakeful existence" (*Wach-Sein*), "Fate" (*Schicksal*) and "causation" (*Kausalität*). It was Nietzsche who used the terms chosen here: "Apollonian" and "Dionysian."

Returning to literature, we find in it two tendencies called into being by what I have just ventured to call the consciousness of unconsciousness. They are two, because a difference arises according to whether it is creative imagination or observation of reality, which is the second factor. In one case, the tendency is romanticism, in the other—realism. But both are distinctly opposed to Classicism; the Apollonian surface of "wakefulness" and "causation" meets its contrast in the Dionysian depth of "existence" and "destiny."

IV.

It was in the literary presentation of country life that this contrast made itself particularly felt. "The peasant," so Oswald Spengler justly says in his post-war philosophy (*Der Untergang des Abendlandes*, II, 113),—"the peasant is the Eternal Man, independent of all culture which dwells in towns. He precedes it, he survives it, stolidly perpetuating his kind from generation to generation, limited to vocations and accomplishments which are bound to earth, a mystic soul and yet a plain understanding, attached to practical things,—the issue and ever-flowing well of the blood which makes the history of the world in its towns . . . The peasant's piety of to-day is older than Christianity, his gods are older than all higher religion . . . His real morality, his real metaphysics—never thought worth the discovery by any town-bred scholar—lie outside all history of religion and of intellect. They have no history at all."

It is easy to realise that in the face of such elemental unconsciousness, the whole method of Classicism was foredoomed to barrenness. Virgil exclaimed:

O fortunatos nimium, sua si bona norint, agricolas!

Do not these very words reflect a momentary suspicion of the small country gentleman of Andes that, after all, the peasant mind is too pedestrian to be aware of the happiness with which the imagination of the townsman has surrounded it? In any case, the warning was lost, and the classical idyll, both in antique

and in modern times, re-created village life for itself according to its own likings, as a bower of bliss on the bosom of Nature, contrasted with wall-imprisoned town humanity. Classicist France produced new specimens of this view : realist Russia laughed at France's and her own classicist idylls, saying that those who lived and acted in them, were not peasants but *paysans*.

And it was only a *paysanesque* idyll that Polish Literature possessed until the appearance of Casimir Brodziński.

V.

The progress made by Brodziński in the direction described above was the outcome partly of foreign influences, partly of the conditions of his own life. Being the son of the tenant of a large estate in the country, he was himself country-bred. Persecuted by a cruel stepmother, and finding no comfort in a severe father, he went for consolation to village women, who took a motherly interest in him. In such manner he was initiated from his very childhood into the peculiar metaphysics and religion of the village people, which, according to the just remark of Spengler, is older than all the existing religions of a higher order. Is this to mean that to him really the soul of that people was revealed? This would again be exaggeration, though he may well have thought so himself. A child is a child, whether born a lord's son or a peasant's : so there is one immovable factor in the rush of evolution. Another—noted above—is the peasant soul, and particularly the soul of a peasant woman. And there is natural affinity between these two inalterable forces : the tenderness of the grown female for the cub is one of the foremost dogmas of the religion of Mother Earth. Here, then, we have a natural relation of elemental sympathy. But let the child only grow up, let its development go the road of town culture, and that connection, loosening by degrees, will finally be dissolved entirely—leaving behind it a fond memory, that rich source of happy illusion.

In this form the Polish village was alive in the soul of Casimir Brodziński—as memories. “ Having lost sight of the village,” so his biographer¹ says, “ he longed for it in the streets of Warsaw. The reality of the past began to change into an ideal world. It was in colours borrowed from the rainbow that he desired to clothe those Cracow country girls who reminded him of his native districts, and to the peasant lads he desired to give such vigour as would withstand any enemy. What the heart whispered, reason confirmed with serious arguments. In his meditations on

¹ Professor W. Gubrynowicz : *K. Brodziński*, I, 393.

poetry, the author had then arrived at the conclusion that the fullest expression of the national spirit was to be found in folk-song, and from this, accordingly, poetry ought to draw its life-blood. Furthermore, he was of opinion that the chief characteristics of Slavonic poetry were meekness and simplicity of feeling, that the character of Poles, being Slavs, leaned towards the idyll, and that the idyll was of vital importance as a typically Polish and Slavonic form of poetry. The impulse of sentiment, then, combined with the stimulus of reasoning to encourage Brodziński, after several minor scenes from country life, to produce a work on a larger scale, and this work was *Wiesław*."

Folk-song, then, was the principal source—a native source, surely; but for his estimation of it as the "fullest expression of the national spirit" in poetry the Polish idyllist was indebted not so much to his own impressions and reflections, as to a universal tendency of the age—a tendency born in England and there embodied in Bishop Percy's *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*, and later in the more popular, if less genuine, Ossianic rhapsodies. In Germany, the tendency was framed into a system in the theory of Herder and the practice of the Romantics with Bürger at their head, himself an ardent admirer of English and Scottish popular song and ballad. The Neo-Classicism of Goethe and Schiller considerably modified the current, which was mad in its first fervour: it became moderated by the principle that "Nature is only vanquished by obeying" (*Natura non vincitur nisi parendo*)—and a partial submission to Classical discipline. This partial submission bore fruit in Goethe's idyllic poem *Hermann und Dorothea*, Classical in form, Romantic in matter. In the opinion of Polish scholars, this very poem is the most important foreign source for Brodziński's *Wiesław*. This view is right in itself: such a model idyll once existing, it could not but have its influence on Brodziński. But it seems to me that even if *Hermann und Dorothea* had never been written, Brodziński's *Wiesław* would be what it is. It should, besides, be noticed that there is another work, left behind by Greek antiquity, without which neither *Hermann und Dorothea* nor *Wiesław* would ever have come into being, and that work is Longus's *Dafnis and Chloë*. Even if Brodzinski should never have known this work, the remark holds true, because the work was an ingredient of the literary atmosphere in which he lived and moved and had his being.

What are the contents of his epoch-making idyll?

To the Pole, they are familiar from childhood. *Wiesław*

belongs to our choicest classics and is placed in fine illustrated editions in the hands of children at the school age. For foreign readers, however, a short account of the contents may be necessary.

Under the roof of a well-to-do peasant in the neighbourhood of Cracow, named Stanislas, there is growing up, besides his own daughter Bronisława, an adopted son, a village orphan, of the name of Wiesław. Everything seems to point to his marrying Bronisława when they grow up, and inheriting the farm and cottage of her father. But destiny decrees otherwise. Old Stanislas sends Wiesław to the fair in Cracow to buy horses. On his way home, the young man passes a village in which holiday merry-making is just going on. Received hospitably by the people of the place, he dances with a pretty country girl, Halina : the description of these dances and games is the most curious part of the poem. Wiesław returns home with the horses he has bought, but his heart remains with Halina. In view of such a decree of destiny, old projects must be abandoned : Stanislas is grieved, his daughter sheds tears, but what is to be done? there is no fighting against love. An old villager named Jan is sent, according to old country custom, to carry Wiesław's marriage proposal to the house of his love; and his mission is the second centre of poetical interest in the idyll. The honest widow who had brought Halina up, confesses that the girl is not her own daughter, but was found on the road as a baby. It is discovered that Halina is the second daughter of Stanislas, whom he had lost in old days of war and invasion. Thus, sadness in the family gives way to joy : even Bronisława is happy, having gained more by finding a sister than she lost by losing a bridegroom.

It is recognition then—the technical *anagnorismos* of Greek poetry—which is the final aim of the poem and its solution. Without it, there would be a painful note of discord remaining—the grief of the father and the despair of the daughter. This recognition comes directly from Greek romance of the *Daphnis and Chloë* type, and indirectly, through it, from new Attic comedy and its model Euripides. His *Ion*, which is preserved, is the first original of all those scenes of recognition which the Romantic poetry of the earlier nineteenth century is so fond of. The realism of the later years of the century rejects this device, and justly. For does not the incident introduced into *Wiesław* border on miracle? Wiesław, the adopted son of Stanislas, meets, and loves, a girl in a strange village, who turns out to be the daughter of his adoptive father. Whose hand is it then that leads him to her, whose will kindles in his heart the flame so happily directed?

The hand and will of Providence, obviously : the Greeks called it *Tyche*, but a name does not take from this force its magic character. And realism does not recognise such marvellous dispositions of Providence as typical enough for art.

So much for the story. As regards the characters, it is their *meekness* which strikes us above all—a Slavonic racial characteristic, according to the author. It distinguishes all his figures—old and young, men and women alike. Old Jan, sent as a messenger of love, must not, according to old custom, confine himself to praise of the young wooer. Some criticism is expected from his lips as well, and he gives it in this form :

“Industrious and humble though he be at home, Wiesław has at times proved a bird of another feather when abroad : ready to block the way with his cart even to a noble, to lord it over all the dancers at the inn, to drive the foreign soldiers from the tavern parlour, to mock the travelling mountaineers in their sandals—such have been his sports until now ! ”

But old Jan himself admits that these alleged faults are such as please the lasses.

Thus, we have before us the perfect image of a “Paradise Lost,” evoked by a tender poet for tender readers. To them also he turns in the last words of his poem, asking them to supplement for themselves what he has imperfectly described.

“For you will better describe in your own heart what you love so warmly.”

In doing so, the poet tacitly supposes that it is exactly this tender reader who will best be able, by his idyllic sentiment, to fathom the enigmatic soul of the peasant in its elemental unconsciousness. That was a delusion as noble in its motives as it was terrible in its consequences : the massacre of the Galician gentry in 1846 was the response to the “peasant mania” of Romantic idealists. I have no doubt that a Russian realist critic, like Belinsky or Mikhailovsky, if he had read *Wiesław*, would have labelled its peasants as sneeringly as *paysans* as he had done so for the Watteau images of peasantry in the Russian literature of the eighteenth century.

VI.

The presentation of the peasant in literature, besides its æsthetic value, acquired social and political importance in all the countries in which the peasantry, owing to the conditions of historical development, were suffering from social disabilities. Peasant serfdom, once common all over Europe, survived longest

in Russia and the part of Poland it had annexed. The age-long wrongs demanded redress, and the abolition of all that stood in the way of such redress. That was another natural consequence of historical evolution. In their fully justified struggle to attain enfranchisement, the peasantry found allies among the members of the privileged classes. This was needed to make the social struggle of the peasants effective: without such associates, they could not help themselves. The allies of the peasants were of all sorts and conditions; but we may distinguish two principal groups among them. In the first, we find the persons who in French are called *déclassés*—men who on the ground of their origin and education might have held a place among the privileged class, but either did not find such a place at all, or found one which did not answer their expectations, and therefore (not to speak of incidental causes) preferred to turn towards the less favoured social class, and to lead it in its fight for freedom and equality. At all times, down from Peisistratos and the Alcmeonids, it was from among such people that the leaders in social crises and revolutions were recruited.

This, then, was the first group of outside sympathisers with the peasant cause. Before passing on to the second, it must be mentioned that, so far, we are not dealing with a force of exalted moral ideals. The less favoured class, in its struggle for equal rights, is actuated by the instinct of self-preservation, by motives of class egoism, which are just enough, but not moral in the higher sense of the word. Those, again, who thrust themselves upon the multitude as their leaders, act under the stimulus of ambition, or need, or offence. As said before, their mentality may be outwardly very different, but at bottom there is always egoism—open or concealed.

We now come to the second group—the one which interests us most in the present connection. It is made up of men of noble, altruistic disposition: that is their common characteristic, whatever the different shadings may be. Some are sober and honest politicians, who, though born and brought up among the privileged class, are aware that the requirements of progress in the State and the principles of social justice are incompatible with continuance of the old conditions. And they have strength of character enough to put general and social interests above their own private well-being. Others, again, are hot-heads and dreamers: the idea of social equality appeals to them chiefly by its moral beauty. Their aim is to right ancient wrongs: the oppressed, accordingly, seem to them in all respects worthy of

such redress, in every way better than their oppressors. On the soil of such a mentality, idealist notions about the peasant grow luxuriantly, and a new *paysannerie* arises—not classical or romantic any longer, but in a way—and only in a way—realistic. Political conditions were the cause why this semi-realistic tendency developed chiefly (though not exclusively) in Russia. Poland being at that time—in the middle years of the XIXth century—subject to foreign domination, had no decisive voice in settling the further destinies of its own peasantry. In the two Western partitioning states, the question of the enfranchisement of the peasant was engulfed in, and intermixed with, other State affairs. The problem was clear-cut and acute only in Russia, because the Russian peasantry was in exactly the same position as the Polish one. It was in Russia, accordingly, that the pseudo-realistic idealisation of the peasant bore richest literary fruit. The foremost Russian writers represent it in their works: beginning with Grigorovich's memorable peasant story *Anthony Goremyka*, we meet among Russian writers on peasant themes such names as Turgenev (*Sportsman's Notebook*), Nekrasov (the peasants' poet *par excellence*), and, greatest and most dangerous of them all, Count Leo Tolstoy.

He was the most dangerous: we must beware of illusions easily born under the spell of this powerful genius of world-wide fame. The aim of his whole literary activity was the destruction of the thin and weak upper layer of higher culture—how thin and weak, has only recently been discovered!—in order to lay bare the bedrock of the people's nature. In the life of the educated class the author sees nothing but vanity and waste of vital energies: science, art, education, all the refinements of society—all this is worthless in his eyes. Among the people, on the other hand, he finds an abundance of activity, guided by the people's own, unborrowed, moral and religious principles. If this contrast between town and country were clothed in the ancient literary garb of *Daphnis and Chloë* it would be perfectly harmless: the reader simply would not believe it, and the classical game of an hour would have no influence on his behaviour in real life. But the case of Tolstoy is very different: he took the colours of his descriptions from the reality of life itself; the pictures of his Karatayevs and Akims were convincing, and people believed in them. This belief in one's own worthlessness and the superiority of the peasant folk was dogma, if not for the whole of the Russian educated class in the last half-century, at any rate for its largest and what we may call its best section.

The present writer remembers seeing a photograph in his young days which produced a peculiar impression upon him. It had been made by order of a Russian country gentleman and his younger brother, and their own figures were used in it for an allegorical tableau. The elder brother was dressed in town clothes, the younger one—in peasant costume, and the townsman was taking off his hat, with a humble bow, to the villager. The photo was a demonstration excellently illustrative of the sentiments of the Russian "intelligentsia." But it seemed to me to characterise them also in a way little dreamed of by the noble utopians who had had it made. The disguise of one of the brothers unintentionally symbolised the plain fact that the peasant soul so devoutly worshipped by the educated Russian was his own soul, the soul of the intellectual, which, by an intelligible but harmful allusion, he was assuming to exist under the peasant's cloak.

The revolution of 1917 has ruthlessly shattered this illusion. Before I left Russia,¹ in the spring of 1922, one of the most eminent remaining representatives (few, alas!) of the Russian educated class, said to me: "Now this peasant romanticism is impossible among us"—and what he meant was not the literary attitude of the earlier Romantic poets and novelists like Zhukovsky, Karamzin, or even Pushkin, but the pseudo-realism of later enthusiasts from Grigorovich to Tolstoy. An awakening from these fond dreams was bound to come. But it only came at last when the Russian "intelligentsia," unconsciously deluded by its spiritual leaders, had unwarily delivered itself into the claws of the "proletariat," to be torn to pieces by them.

T. ZIELIŃSKI.

[Reasons of space unfortunately compel us to hold over till the next number a supplementary article by Professor Roman Dyboski on "*The Peasant in Modern Poland*."—ED.]

¹ The author had held, for many years, the chair of Classics in the University of Petrograd, and produced most of the text-books on Classical subjects used in Russian Secondary Schools and Universities. He is now Professor of the same subject in the Polish University of Warsaw. —(Translator's Note.)

THE POLISH PEASANTS. (II.)

(From the Polish of W. S. Reymont.)

THE DEATH OF MATTHEW BORYNA.

It must have been late at night, the first cocks were beginning to crow, when suddenly Boryna stirred in his bed, as if he were waking. At the same moment the light of the moon struck the windows and flooded the room, overspreading his face with a silver foam.

He sat up in his bed, and, nodding his head and labouring with his throat, he tried to say something, but there came only a bubbling sound from him.

He sat for a long while, looking round with a vacant stare, sometimes moving his fingers in the moonlight as though he would gather in his hands the sparkling stream of radiance which beat into his eyes.

"It is dawning . . . Time . . ." he murmured at last, getting out of bed and standing on the floor.

He looked out through the window, and, as if awakening from a heavy sleep, he thought the sun was high, that he had overslept himself, and that some urgent work awaited him.

"Time to be up, time . . ." he repeated, crossing himself many times and beginning his prayer, and he looked round for his clothes, he stretched out his hand for his boots, where they used to stand; but not finding anything ready to hand, he forgot all again, and his hands wandered helplessly round him; his prayer broke off again and again: he only muttered soundlessly some disconnected words.

Things got tangled up in his head—memories of farm work, and old happenings, and echoes of all that had been going on around him during the whole time of his sickness—it was all trickling into him in faint streamlets, in pale remembrances, in movements that had disappeared in his consciousness, like furrows in mown fields. It was all awaking of a sudden now, curling in his brain like smoke and pressing out of it, so that he jumped up between whiles in pursuit of one phantom or another, but before he caught hold of it, it dissolved in his memory like rotten tissue. His soul flickered like a flame with nothing to feed it.

He knew only as much now as dried-up trees dream of at the coming of spring time, when it seems to them that it is time to wake from the torpor of winter, time to let loose the gathered sap of life, time to sing, with the winds, the wedding song of youth . . . and they know not how idle their dreams are, and how vain their flutterings. . . .

Then, whatever he did, he did it like a horse which, after a long spell in the treadmill, continues from habit to pace round and round when it is free.

Matthew opened the window and looked out upon the world—he looked into the other room—after long meditation, he dug a little in the ashes of the open hearth, and then went out into the court-yard, barefoot and in his shirt as he stood.

The door was open, the entrance flooded with moonlight; before the threshold, Łapa, the old dog, was huddled up asleep. But hearing the sound of footsteps he awoke, growled at first, and then, recognising his master, followed him.

Matthew stopped before the door, and, scratching his ear, cast about in his mind what was the urgent farm work which was waiting for him?

The dog joyfully jumped up at his breast, he stroked the dog as of old, looking round, embarrassed, upon the world.

It was as light as in daytime; the moon was high up above the cottage, the dark-blue shadow slid down from the white walls, the waters of the pond shone like mirrors, the village lay in deep silence; only birds were bursting their throats in the hedges.

Suddenly Boryna seemed to remember something, for he walked quickly into the court-yard. All the doors stood open. The boys were snoring under the roof of the barn. He looked into the stables, and patted the horses; they neighed. Then he put his head into the cow-house; the cows lay in a row, their backs only visible in the light. It occurred to him that he must pull out a cart, he even caught hold of the beam. But then he saw the plough glittering close to the pig-sty, so he hurried there. Again he forgot everything before he had reached it.

He now stood in the middle of the court-yard, turning round on all sides, because it seemed to him that somebody was calling him.

The crane of the well was sticking up high in the air by his side, and casting a long shadow upon the ground.

“What is it?” he asked, listening for a reply.

The orchard, cut into spaces by the light, seemed to block

his path; the silvery leaves were whispering something in a low voice.

"Who is calling me?" he wondered, touching the trees.

The dog, following him all the while, whined. Boryna stopped, drew a deep sigh, and said cheerfully:

"Time to be sowing, doggie, isn't it?"

But in a moment he had forgotten that, too; everything was crumbling to pieces in his memory, like clumps of dry sand between the fingers. Only, new recollections were continually pushing him forward somewhere again. He was twining himself up in these delusions like a reel in a thread eternally flying, but always in one spot.

"Of course . . . time to be sowing," he said again, and walked briskly along the shed and out between the fences, into the fields. He came up against that unhappy haystack,¹ burned down in winter and now built up again. He wanted to get round it, but suddenly he jumped back, there was a flash of light in his mind, he threw himself back in time like lightning, he tore a pole from the fence and, clutching it with both hands like a pitchfork, he made a rush at the haystack with a fierce look, but before he struck at anything he dropped the pole again helplessly.

Behind the haystack, close to the road and next to the potato field, there was a long stretch of ploughed soil. He stopped over it, measuring it with amazed eyes.

The moon was half-way down the sky, the grounds were basking in hazy gleams and lay pearled over with dew, and seemed to listen in silence.

An impenetrable stillness was beating up from the fields, the hazy distance united earth to sky, from the meadows whitish fogs were creeping up and trailing over the cornfields, like a tissue, enveloping them, as if it were with a warm, wet sheepskin.

The corn had grown up by this time, and stood in a green wall, bending its heavy tops over the footpath, with the weight of ears which hung down like the ruddy beaks of chickens. The stalks of wheat rose like pillars, they stood proudly, glittering with blackish feathers. The oats and the barley, just coming to ear, shone in their greenness like meadows wrapt in grey coverlets of haze and light.

The second cocks were crowing, the night was far advanced, the fields were plunged in a deep and tranquil sleep and there was

¹ Where he had once surprised his wife with his son.

a low rustle as if they were breathing, with an echo of the day's toils and cares, as a mother breathes when she lies down among the little children who confidently sleep on her lap.

Boryna suddenly knelt down on the ploughed field and began to gather earth into his outspread shirt, as though he were gathering seed-corn from a bag—until having gathered so much that he could hardly stand up with the burden, he crossed himself, tried the swing of his arm, and began to sow. . . .

He bent under the weight, and slowly, step by step, and with a sweeping, semicircular, casting movement, as of benediction, he sowed the earth over the field.

The dog followed him, and when some startled bird flew from under his feet, he chased it for a while and again returned to do duty behind his master.

And old Boryna, gazing ahead into the world of that spring night full of glooms, walked down the field quietly like a phantom, blessing each lump of earth, each blade of grass, and sowing, sowing continually, sowing unwearyingly.

He stumbled over clods of soil, he got entangled in the furrows, sometimes he even fell; but he knew and felt nothing of it all, save that dumb and invincible impulse—to sow.

He went to the very edge of the fields, and when earth was wanting in his hands, he stooped and gathered new earth, and when stones and thorny hedges barred his way, he turned aside. He went far, where birds' voices died away, and the whole village was lost somewhere in foggy gloom, and the vast sea of gray field was around him; he was lost in it like a stray bird or like a soul flying away from earth—and again he emerged nearer to the houses, he returned within the circle of birds' song, and within the circle of men's toil which had been still for a while, as though the rustling wave of corn were bearing him up on the edge of the living world.

"Now let the harrows go over it, Jack, and lightly, mind!" he sometimes called out, as if to the servant.

So the time passed and he sowed indefatigably, only stopping sometimes to rest and stretch himself, and again he took to his fruitless work, to this vain toil, to these futile efforts.

And then again, when the night was trembling to its end, the stars were paling, and the last cocks were crowing before dawn, he slowed down with the work, stopped more frequently, and forgetting to gather earth, he sowed with empty hand, as though it were himself only he was sowing now to the last bit on this ancestral soil—all the days he had lived through, all the

human life he had received and was giving back now to these holy fields and to God Everlasting.

And something strange began to happen at this last hour of his life : the sky grew gray, like homespun cloth, the moon set, all lights went out, the world grew blind at once and was drowned in a welter of dim floods ; and something inconceivable seemed to arise somewhere and advance in heavy tread amid the glooms, so that the earth seemed to shake.

A prolonged, ill-boding blast blew from the forests.

The lonely trees quaked, a rain of dry leaves pattered among the ears, the corn and grasses began to wave, and from the low-quavering fields a voice was lifted up still fearsomely moaning :

“ Goodman ! Goodman ! ”

The green feather of the barley trembled, as though weeping, and clung in hot kisses to his wearied feet.

“ Goodman ! ” the wheat seemed to whine, standing in his way, and scattering a hail of dewy tears.

Birds raised a wailing cry. The wind broke into a sob above his head. The fog enveloped him in a moist web, and the voices multiplied and grew louder, beating from all sides uninter-ruptedly :

“ Goodman ! Goodman ! ”

At last he heard them, for, looking round, he exclaimed in a low voice :

“ Well, here I am, what is it ? What ? ”

Suddenly all grew dumb around, only when he moved on again to sow with a hand grown heavy and empty, the Earth spoke up in one huge choir :

“ Stay ! Stay with us ! Stay ! ”

He stopped, surprised ; it seemed as though everything were moving to meet him : grasses were creeping, the waving corn was flowing, the fields were encompassing him round, the whole world seemed to rise and bear down upon him, till fear caught him ; he wanted to cry, but no voice came from the compressed throat ; he wanted to run, but strength failed him and the earth caught him by the feet, the corn entangled him, the furrows held him back, the hard sods snatched at him, the trees threatened him, blocking his way, the thistles tore him, and the stones wounded him, an evil wind chased him, the night led him astray, and so did the voice, now beating over all the world :

“ Stay ! Stay ! ”

He stood benumbed at once, and all was quiet again and

stopped in its place. A flash of lightning tore the film of death from his eyes, heaven opened before him, and there, in blinding glories, God the Father, seated on a throne of corn sheaves, stretched out His arms towards him and said benignly :

“ Come to Me, human soul. Come, weary toiler.”

Boryna staggered and raised his hands, as when adoring the Sacrament.

“ O God, repay ! ” he said, and fell forward on his face before this Majesty of the Holiest.

He fell and died in that hour of the grace of the Lord.

* * * * *

Dawn rose over his body, and the dog howled long and mournfully.

AT THE FEAST OF THE GODS :

CONTEMPORARY DIALOGUES.¹

DRAMATIS PERSONÆ.

A PUBLIC MAN.

A GENERAL.

A DIPLOMAT.

A WELL-KNOWN AUTHOR.

A RELIGIOUS THINKER.

A REFUGEE.

DIALOGUE THE FIFTH.

"The Russian church is paralysed."—DOSTOYEVSKY.

"From the east will this star shine forth."—DOSTOYEVSKY.

"A woman arrayed with the sun."—REVELATION.

RELIG. PHILOS. : I think you miss the chief point. The most valuable acquisition of Russian life, so important in itself that it will counterbalance and, in a certain sense, even justify all our trials, seems to have escaped you. I mean the emancipation of the Russian Orthodox Church from the State, from deadening red tape. The Russian Church is at present free, though persecuted. And the free Church will reassemble and regenerate the scattered body of the Russian State. The key to the understanding of Russian history must be sought in the life of the Church. The laws of its internal sequence lie here.

GENERAL : But has not the Church also become infected with Bolshevism during the revolution ? I must say that it looked like it at many Church conferences in various parts of Russia.

RELIG. PHILOS. : The movement was but a superficial one, and only the most unstable elements were affected by it : some radical priests and clerical social democrats, socialistic deacons and readers, joined by a few loud-mouthed laymen. The thing was bound to come, and has already run its course.² The revolutionary wave has broken on the threshold of the Church. The Church has humbly, but firmly, repulsed the revolution. See what is taking

¹ Written in 1918; we understand they have been published in Germany.—ED.

² As our information serves us, the speaker would be likely to repeat this estimate at the present time. Since this article was written, however, there have been more formidable attempts by the Soviet Government to disrupt the Orthodox Church.—ED.

place at the Russian Church Council; if spiritual weapons for the regeneration of Russia are being forged anywhere, then, undoubtedly, it is only here.

DIPLOMAT: And I again insist that, if anyone is to blame for the national disaster connected with the revolution, the body of the Church must be held most responsible. I shall not even mention the servility and silence of the higher dignitaries of the Church—too much has been already said about it—but besides this the Church here revealed a cultural insolvency, a historical bankruptcy. However groundless the dream of a God-fearing nation, it could still have reasonably been expected that, during her thousand years' existence, the Church would have become part of the national soul, dear and precious to it. But, in fact, the Church has been set aside without the slightest resistance, as though the people neither needed nor cared for her; and villages showed even greater indifference than towns. Nobody, not even enemies of the Russian Church, ever imagined that her influence on the life of the people was so purely superficial, and we suddenly perceive that the people are simply not Christians. American missions are working to convert them as in *partibus infidelibus*. And what can be said about the influence of the Russian Church upon general principles and the discipline of life? Can our Church attempt to compete in this respect with the West European confessions, in particular with Protestantism, so obviously victorious in this war? The revolution has sent in a heavy historical account to the Church, and I doubt whether she will be able to meet it.

RELIG. PHILOS.: You form your judgment of the Church on the same basis as most educated Russians; you place yourself somewhere outside of it: a peasant Church that exists for the ignorant masses, who were permitted to invent a God even by Voltaire. Coldly and arrogantly you set that Church down as having failed to pass a historical examination you have yourself still more hopelessly bungled. This is our national misfortune: our educated classes have adopted an attitude of irresponsible opposition in regard to the Church; you only proffer demands and criticise, instead of actively joining in the work and sharing the responsibility. Try to do so and your critical fervour will expire at once, for, truly, the work of the Lord is hard, and accursed is the man who does it negligently. If you are right and our Church has not proved adequate to the demands of history, the only practical outcome is this—we must acknowledge the Church more than we ever did and recognise our personal

responsibility for her future. To belong to the Church imposes obligations on us.

GENERAL : Yes, and the first is—truth and sincerity. Therefore, we cannot get away from the fact that something is wrong with Russian orthodoxy. There seems to be an internal, weakening disease, and the best proof of it is—the revolution. Have we not here a staggering testimony to the decadence of orthodoxy? A mania for preserving in salt has caused the whole body to deteriorate. The Church had no right to surrender her sacred power without at least a struggle. But she committed an act of treason and washed her hands afterwards, too; she is now expiating her sin through this persecution.

RELIG. PHILOS. : The Church has never rejected the ideas of sacred power and Christian statesmanship, nor does she at present, but she ought to have rejected a Tsar, influenced by Rasputin, as soon as it became evident that Russia was governed by the inspiration of a Khlyst.¹ In not having done so in time, in accepting the situation, the Church, both clergy and laymen, has truly sinned—but this is due to the general paralysis of the Church, to her subjugation to the State. Now at least, thank God! the Church is free, and administered on the collegiate principle inherent to her.

GENERAL : But please tell me, who could really have emancipated the Church, if she did not do it herself? Surely not the Provisional Government or this so-called Russian Republic?² And if an external paralysis of the Church did exist, well, it must have been internal also, and I will not take it upon myself to judge whether she is now cured. But that there is such a paralysis, is patent to me from the fact that the Church was incapable of saving the Tsar from Rasputin at a most crucial moment. Where, then, is the power of the apostolic Church, the right to absolve and bind? I am not a mystic, but I cannot help thinking that the powers of evil were enabled to produce Rasputin only owing to the lack of any resistance. When apostolic voices ought to have made themselves heard, the matter was settled by a crazy bullet. But, as bullets are incompetent

¹ The Khlysts are an ancient, mystic sect whose chief tenets seem to be the reincarnation of Jesus Christ, and especially of the Mother of God, and the direct action of the Holy Ghost on believers gathered together in prayer. To obtain the action of the Spirit they resort to methods akin to those of the Dancing Dervishes, such as dancing and self-scourging. The sect is widely known for its immoral teaching.

² Church independence was restored by the re-establishment of the Patriarchate under the Provisional Government in 1917. Russia was declared a republic during this period.—ED.

to contend with mystical forces, Rasputin's blood, spilt on Russian soil, raised the many-headed monster of Bolshevism and a socialist fanaticism with its evident taint of Sadism. I doubt whether such a paralysis can be cured by merely reverting to collegiate Church organisation.

RELIG. PHILOS. : Doubts, similar to these, can and must be answered, not by words, but by deeds and sacrifice. The life of the Church must be regenerated—this is the first and most vitally important task in Russia at present, for patriotic, cultural and even political reasons. It is only around such a spiritual centre that Russia can start rebuilding; and I therefore consider our Church Council the greatest event of modern Russian history, of the revolution in particular, with all its changes of scenery and petty party feuds. I am fully aware of the importance of politics, economics and culture, but have become a most definite churchman, and shall be glad to undertake, for the benefit of the Church, the work I would not have touched with my little finger for the sake of a godless imperialism.

PUBLIC MAN : I confess that I still fail to grasp what national import the work of the Church Council can have beyond the purely professional interests of the clergy.

RELIG. PHILOS. : I shall answer you by a paradox : only things appertaining to the Church have a cultural future in Russia—appertaining to the Church, I mean, of course, in the broadest sense of the term. And it is only in such a clericalising¹ of Russian life that I see any hope of the cultural regeneration of the country. We are now witnessing an experiment of profane “socialistic” culture on a colossal scale, and see how absolutely sterile and hopeless it has turned out to be, even in its most vital problem—the discipline of labour. Everything has gone to pieces, labour has failed to produce, and socialistic scorpions are the only available remedy. Without the help of Church education we shall be unable to regenerate either our economics or the State. But my aspirations go still further : I dream of a spiritual domination in our schools, their “clericalisation,” so to say, that would fill in the gulf between the Church and secular education.

AUTHOR : I quite understand you, and I agree with you that, in an atmosphere of general callousness, the Church Council is doing a work of overwhelming importance. May God help you in yours ! But I have a difficulty which I cannot solve : up to the present the Council has been proceeding like a Church

¹ The word “clericalising” is used in Russian in a less narrow sense than in English.—ED.

Constituent Assembly and evolving a sort of constitution. This is certainly inevitable in the business of cleaning Augean stables, centuries old; but still I fear that this process may give rise to a certain type of clerical liberalism, a sort of "constitutional-democratic" orthodoxy. I must confess that I am rather afraid of such a smooth constitutional orthodoxy; a most dangerous species of clericalism may nest therein. We might find that we have overdone the polishing of our primitive, retrograde, but staunch and dearly beloved ancient faith.

RELIG. PHILOS. : Such fears can only arise outside, beyond the atmosphere of the Council. And of greater importance than the actual sum of work achieved is the spirit of the Church which is being brought into daily life, our participation in the life of the Church. It is a genuine happiness to feel the reality of unity in the Church, the solidarity which bishops, clergy and laymen display at the Council. I don't think there is any motive to fear the tendency you mention. Have you not noticed a general spiritual revival which will result in quickening parish church interests? . . . The 28th of January of this year is one of the happiest days of my life: during the people's religious procession in Moscow the fervour of their religious ecstasy made them sing the paschal hymn in the winter streets. The crowd was ready to suffer for its faith, to brave bullets for it. . . . The blood of martyrs is already washing clean the historical transgressions of the Church, whitening her robes.

AUTHOR : Yes, that is really so. A new and powerful force is entering Russian life, to save and heal. May it only not abate as quickly as it has arisen. Unfortunately, that would be like Russia.

DIPLOMAT. I too think we must estimate this religious movement very carefully. It is due to the savage methods of the Bolsheviks, who have placed the Church in a desperate position. The necessity of self-defence calls forth a corresponding reaction; and we see that these religious processions have a perturbing resemblance to political manifestations. They likewise have a flavour of perplexity and fear, hardly noticeable in the general enthusiasm. It seems to me that both extremes are equally dangerous for the Church: a violent, catastrophical commotion, caused by persecution, and a restoration of the princes of the Church, with all their privileges. For the clergy have been educated by the old *régime* and long for it as for a paradise lost.

RELIG. PHILOS. : No restoration can any longer imperil the Church. She has tasted of the blessings of liberty and will not

surrender either her freedom or her canonical order, which was trampled on during the period of the Synod. I hope, too, that our bishops will also find it impossible to return to the old days when they were the slaves of their position, imprisoned in their episcopal palaces. They have come into direct contact with the flock of believers who will cling to them henceforth, and I think that they themselves will not care to be cut off from the people again. However, I will not deny that the Church, in order to grow, must imbibe new strength with free creative impulses from both clergy and laymen; and this makes the *rapprochement* of the intelligentsia to the Church so important. For the intelligentsia will perish without the Church, and the Church will not be able to fulfil her task alone, without an influx of new forces from outside. Under these conditions no reaction need be feared. The Church has acquired independence and pliability, is developing its power of resistance and will oppose any fresh violence.

GENERAL: A thistle to bear figs! No, let us cast the intelligentsia out of the reckoning. We must prepare to manage for ourselves without it. A general popular movement towards the Church seems hopeless; at the best the Church will be surrounded by a circle of atheism and indifference, at the worst—a direct persecution may continue, in some more civilised form, it is true, as, for example, in France. _ Being a soldier, I have accustomed myself to be ready for the worst: there are catacombs ahead. Besides—though I confess to be a poor judge on these questions—I cannot understand how such special hopes can be placed in the reform of the parish, which, to all intents and purposes, will merely democratise the parish by opening the door to the man in the street.

RELIG. PHILOS.: But there is nothing else, except this movement of the people towards her, that the Church can rely on in her struggle with persecution. And, naturally, we see all such elements called to arms; the appearance of a class of democratic churchfolk is one of the most significant phenomena of the Russian revolution.

REFUGEE: Nevertheless, you cannot pour new wine into old skins, and the present-day parish exists principally for the sake of convenience; it cannot be regarded as a live church unit. The most active and sincere members of the Church never find complete satisfaction merely in parochial life and are constantly seeking other forms of religious communion. It is an open question for me, whether there really is any new wine in the masses of

church folk, or even at the Council—which may be considered as a sort of review of the forces of the church. My impressions of the Council may be superficial, but what I see is a great deal of piety, reverence for tradition—something akin to the spirit of our Old Believers in its best form—but no religious movement. Questions of dogma do not seem to excite much interest or emotion. Can this be really called a Church Council in the true sense of the word? Is it not more like an ecclesiastical Constituent Assembly? And when one comes to consider, how could it be otherwise? Government and academic circles are really equally indifferent to religious questions, but they veil their indifference in pomposity and extreme conservatism. For instance, how was the burning question of the worship of the name of God treated? If one sets aside points of personal vanity which got mixed up with it, it was met with icy coldness. Was a fact of such enormous importance in mystical literature as A. N. Schmidt's "manuscript" even noticed? And yet, this "manuscript" possibly gives the key to the understanding of modern history. What helplessness was displayed by the Council in questions of occultism and anthropology! Granted that all these are small matters, subject to debate and banishment as heresies; still, the main accusation holds good: both inside and outside the Church Council dogmatic stagnation and paralysis reign, and under such conditions we only have the right to expect such a Council as would be convened by order of the Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod. Œcumenical Councils arose at those moments when the life of the Church was at boiling point, when the only possible answer to questions was: "it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us . . ." What we see now, is not a Church Council but merely an All-Russian church conference, entrusted with extraordinary powers—and nothing more.

RELIG. PHILOS.: You are absolutely wrong in what you say. It is easy to criticise, especially if you first take a bird's-eye view that gives you a few chance impressions. To estimate the unprecedented intensity, fertility and rapidity of the work accomplished, you must enter the very heart of council life and study it carefully day by day. I have taken part in many conferences, both academic and political, and I positively affirm that we have never had a single one so enlightened, thorough and capable as this Church Council. All fears for the future of Russia vanished there. As regards the apparent indifference towards questions of dogma, you must not forget that everything comes in its own good time. Questions of the day must be answered first; we must clean our

shrine from the accumulation of dirt that has collected there during centuries, and only after that will questions of dogma arise. Also, everything appertaining to the Church is in reality a question of dogma, and all matters of church organisation are connected with church teaching. Of course, the Council is free from the nervousness, inventiveness, and religious adventurism so common among representatives of the "new schools," such as various mystics, orgiasts, anthroposophists and theosophists, among whom the search after piquancy often overbalances the sense of actuality. You would, perhaps, wish to hear the Council discuss their favourite "Third Testament," or the sexual problem? No, this Council is not a place for Khlyst mentality to display itself.

REFUGEE: Well, a great deal was said about divorce, but very little about the essence, the sacrament of marriage. Probably the catechism makes everything sufficiently clear.

RELIG. PHILOS.: Yes, everything is sufficiently clear if play is not given to sectarian and "third testament" doubts and heresies.

REFUGEE: In spite of what you say, I hold that present day Orthodoxy flavours of the Old Beliefs and is deaf to many questions raised by life. I do not condemn Old Believers;¹ on the contrary, I think that in certain points the Church ought to be more like them, bound by her tradition that holds everything equally important—in principle the Old Believers are right there. But Orthodoxy is a militant, historical and lasting creed, and the Old Belief would be but a compulsory halt in it. This is the position in which our Old Believers have found themselves, for their Church history ends in the 17th century and becomes Church archæology after that. A tragical position which the Old Believers do not perhaps fully realise.

RELIG. PHILOS.: I must say that I don't quite understand what you are driving at. Nothing new has happened in the life of the Church; all these political events and catastrophes have not reached its depths. Orthodoxy will remain itself up to the end of the world, as the "one, œcumenical, apostolic Church."

REFUGEE: The one, œcumenical apostolic Church will, of course, prevail to the end of the world, but whether the present Russian-Greek Church corresponds to it is a debateable question. Personally, I consider we have actually crossed the boundary of

¹ The Old Believers were those who refused to accept the revision of Church books carried out by the Patriarch Nikon in the XVIIth century. They suffered great persecution and, apart from the merits of their contentions, acquired many characteristics of a popular and militant Church.—ED.

historical Orthodoxy and that church history has reached a new epoch, as different from the preceding one as, say, the pre-Constantine epoch is from the one before it. The Constantine era ended for Byzantium in 1453, and for the entire Orthodox Church on the 2(15) March, 1917. The fall of autocracy is a definite boundary in the history of the Church and a boundary which, I think, cannot be effaced by any restoration on Teutonic lines.¹

RELIG. PHILOS. : You return to the widely spread prejudice that orthodoxy and autocracy are connected ; the Black Hundred² affirm it together with some declared enemies of the Church, semi-political authors like Merezhkovsky,³ who flirted with the revolution, until he felt its claws. In general, there is no connection, except a historical one, between the Church and autocracy ; this is finally proved now that Orthodoxy has at last been liberated, and nobody can any longer accuse it of an alliance with autocracy.

REFUGEE : And yet such an alliance did exist, not only historically, but as an internal mystical connection. What is more, it has been in the mind of Orthodoxy ever since St. Constantine to the present day. The Church has always concentrated a special love on her " anointed "—a Branch of David—the Bridegroom of the Church. Examine the liturgy, now being spoilt by artificial omissions : together with obsequiousness of the oratory before the Imperial Court, it also expresses a mystical love. The Church was fully conscious that in such an " External Archbishop," " Vicar of God on earth " she possessed an architect for the City of God, a keeper of the Holy Vineyard. For the only way in which Orthodoxy understood its earthly mission was the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth. When Byzantium fell, the regalia of Monomach were transferred to Moscow and our pious forefathers justly felt their capital to have become the " Third Rome."⁴

RELIG. PHILOS. : You force the dogma of autocracy on ortho-

¹ Written before the end of the Great War, when German influence was again already strong inside Russia.—ED.

² The nickname given to the reactionaries, and especially to mobs collected by them before the Revolution.—ED.

³ Mr. Merezhkovsky was much under the influence of this idea when he worked on the second part of his " Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky " about 1900-1902.—ED.

⁴ After the marriage of Ivan III. with Sophia Palæloga, niece of the last Emperor of Constantinople (1472), a legend was created suggesting that in the XIIth century, Constantine Monomach had bestowed his imperial rights partially or wholly on Vladimir Monomach of Russia (Constantine was grandfather of Vladimir and died in 1055, whereas Vladimir became Grand Prince of Kiev in 1113) ; and Moscow now claimed to be a " Third Rome." This was the critical period in the shaping of the Russian autocracy.—ED.

doxy and ascribe to it the heresy of Cæsaro-papism or the Latin error—a papal Cæsarism turned inside out. This has sometimes happened in our history, but always as the result of abuse or inertia on the side of the Church; but the Church has never regarded it as a dogma as the Roman Catholics did. You are making out matters of court etiquette which have, unfortunately, penetrated into the liturgy, to be questions of principle—an importance which they never possessed.

REFUGEE: If only that which has been sanctified by the Œcumenical Councils is to be considered as dogma of the Church, then, of course, autocracy, together with many other tenets of the Church, all of them possessing dogmatical value—for instance, the question of the worship of the Mother of God,¹ sacraments, etc.—do not come under that heading. But beyond all doubt autocracy was not only of practical value in the history of the Church, but part of her teaching also. For without this assumption it is impossible to understand the history of Byzantium, and in particular of the Œcumenical Councils, which acknowledged the Emperor as holding certain ecclesiastical rights; also, the history of Russian autocracy is otherwise entirely incomprehensible. The Church calls St. Constantine “the first Emperor in Christianity to receive his crown from God” and takes him for an institution of theocracy. But it is unnecessary to go so far back; you know how the question is answered by our Church in the anathemas of the first Sunday in Lent!

RELIG. PHILOS.: Well, many impurities have penetrated into our service during the period of the Tsars. All the commemorations alone are worth a good deal. And now that these impurities have been removed, how luminous the Church has become—like an ikon cleansed of the dust and soot of ages!

REFUGEE: Still, I do not think we have a right to regard everything that displeases us as an impurity; the anathema I mentioned deals with the principal dogmatical heresies the Church encountered—Arian, Macedonian, etc.² And along with

¹ The Russian equivalent of Our Lady.—ED.

² The reference is to *Posledovanie na Nedelyu Pravoslavia* (the Ceremony for the first Sunday in Lent), which commemorates the final triumph of the Orthodox faith after the Iconoclasts in the IXth century. It consists of a commemoration of those who have laboured for the true faith and of an anathema against heretics. The 11th paragraph anathematizes those who deny the divine origin of monarchical power. It had no special bearing on the Russian Tsars, and is based on the theocratic ideas of the Old Testament and well-known passages in St. Paul. This Rite, however, was not instituted by the Œcumenical Council, but appears in its present form in Russia in the XIVth century (Rules of the Metropolitan Cyprian), and can thus be cancelled by a local Council of the Russian Church. The Greek Rite contains only the Commemoration without the Anathema.—ED.

these, under paragraph 11, all those who hold that the Orthodox Tsars rule not by the favour of the Lord, that they do not receive the special Grace of the Holy Ghost to aid them in fulfilling their duties when they are anointed, as well as all rebels and traitors against them, are anathematised.

RELIG. PHILOS. : These anathemas are indubitably of political origin, and have, therefore, very properly, been already banished by the Church.

REFUGEE : But you still meet people who consider that Russia has fallen under this anathema and see the primal reasons of all our misfortunes here, because an anathema is not an empty word,—it will always have its effect.

GENERAL : Quite right ! I was unable to express my thought, but I have been feeling all along that a curse has fallen upon Russia. The fate of the army and of its leaders show that. And look, even this godless Government feels the mystical force of “taking the oath,” for it has invented a “socialistic oath”—the “mark of the beast” of the Apocalypse.¹

DIPLOMAT : You are attaching too serious a meaning to a childish partiality for pomp and farce, and you also allow your fancy too much play when you speak of the mystical force of an oath. As for accusing the Generals, who have all suffered so cruelly at the hands of various governing “spheres,” well, only the influence of mystical prejudice can drive you to that. They have had to sacrifice even their monarchism for the sake of their country.

GENERAL : And immediately paid, together with the Army, the penalty for their sacrifice. When will you listen to the voice of history?

RELIG. PHILOS. : And still I cannot see anything mystical in the connection of orthodoxy and autocracy. Orthodoxy flourished not only in Moscow, but also in the republics of northern Russia, the cradles of great national artistic creations, Church painting and architecture. It has survived the Tartars and sultans, even as it lives on now under Bolshevism. And only those who choose to close their ears to the voice of history can connect the destinies of the two.

REFUGEE : The provincial centres of Orthodoxy which you mention existed only in connection with the capital ; the main artery never traversed them. Orthodoxy has had, ever since Constantine, a world wide historical problem : the establishment

¹ Identification of Lenin with Antichrist has been common among the peasants.—ED.

of an orthodox theocracy, unique, as the Church is unique. For that was the idea of the second and third Rome. The papal power with its ambition of world-supremacy pursued the same end. And this was how the division of the Church took place. The Priest-King and the King-Priest met on the path of theocracy; it was not a matter of personal jealousy of the two popes, or forms of papal-cæsarism, but a vital question in the planning out of the City of God. Relentless history has put an end to both Western and Eastern schemes: Western hierocracy succumbed long ago; the Eastern has fallen now. The great dispute between West and East is over. In 1917 the Constantine era of the Church finally passed away, and it is followed by the next era, analogous to the period of persecutions and catacombs.

DIPLOMAT: The danger is not entirely over if we are to be compelled to taste of the beauties of a restoration, naturally *Germanis auxiliis*. But, of course, our late theocracy of the St. Petersburg period was semi-German and therefore flavoured with Protestantism.¹

REFUGEE: I do not deny the possibility of the establishment in Russia of a constitutional-bourgeois monarchy on a Prussian model with all the decorum of a constitutional system. But that would only be the final stage of decadence of the great "Holy Empire," or "Orthodox Kingdom." This last has fallen and can be regenerated only from the depths of religious consciousness. And the historical boundary has been traced here by Rasputin and his mission of false prophet. I think you do not quite realise the full mystical significance of his work.

RELIG. PHILOS.: And you invent a meaning and sense it never possessed; your hypertrophied mystical fancy sees the Apocalypse in things that really come under the heading of sexual psychopathology. Personally, I see no difference, from the point of view of religion, between the old monarchy and a restoration, if a restoration is to come.¹ This is entirely a question of politics and I will not discuss it now, but the Church should preserve for all times her freedom and independence from the State, under any form of government. The State must naturally, even if only out of political foresight, assist the Church in her work; but the Church should never go further than a correct attitude to the State, never admitting the romance of servility, or another "bridegroom"—to use your own expression.

¹ The whole framework of Russian administration in the St. Petersburg period was in character and spirit largely German.—ED.

² In 1918 many thought it probable that the Germans would bring about a restoration in Russia. It is believed that they approached the Grand Duke Nicholas, who sharply rebuffed their offers of support.—ED.

REFUGEE : Yes, but then it will not be the same orthodoxy that it was.

AUTHOR : But where has our own orthodoxy disappeared to, then? You seem to have your own extraordinary understanding of it.

REFUGEE : Well, as a matter of fact, I think that Orthodoxy, in its historical religious sense has neither future nor present, but only a past. We are now beyond its boundary.⁶ It received a mortal wound in the fall of our Orthodox Empire; we must not close our eyes to that. Theocracy of the "Holy Empire" type has failed; or, to be more accurate, its importance has turned out to be preliminary and reformatory, not a final accomplishment. And, don't you see? this means that the ancient Greco-Roman quarrel has lost its edge because its origin lies not in questions of dogma, but in a view as to the path which theocracy should follow. For both the Churches have travelled their respective paths and have both come to an *impasse*—have failed, if you can use the word failure to describe any lawful and normal development that has outlived itself. In that sense any historical process would be a failure—which, of course, is not true. That is why we have now again before us, with the charm of a new freshness, the old question of the reunion of the Churches: we are attracted and impelled to it by the ominous times that loom before the whole Christian world.

RELIG. PHILOS. : Yes, it is just the moment for Jesuit fathers to catch fish in muddy waters.¹ The spread of the Unia² in the Ukraine is no accident: it is in accordance with plans prepared long ago by Szeptycki, together with the Austrian and German General Staffs. More than ever now, we must wage war on Catholicism.

REFUGEE : A common enemy is advancing upon the whole of Christendom, and his advance does away with old quarrels between Orthodoxy and Catholicism. Differences of dogma

¹ The Roman Catholic Church is at present particularly active in studying the conditions for reunion to which the Refugee alludes.—ED.

² The Unia (1596) was a compromise by which Orthodox populations of the old Polish-Lithuanian State could retain their forms of belief and worship without persecution, on condition of acknowledging the Pope as Head of the Church. When these territories fell to Russia, persecution drove a number of the former Uniats into Catholicism. During the Russian occupation of Galicia in 1915, the Uniats of that Austrian province were feeling little difficulty in rejoining the Orthodox Church until the Russian Government attempted to promote this object by direct pressure. The religious distinctiveness of the Unia was a card in the hands of Austria-Hungary for its design of separating the Ukraine from Russia.—ED.

never really had any vital importance in the question, and they can and must be solved amicably, with a sincere and loving desire for mutual understanding. In reality, neither Catholicism nor Orthodoxy are quite the same as they were. Something visible to only a very few is happening here : a new sense of an Œcumenical Church is coming to life. If this consciousness grows and spreads, all the endless disputes, together with the vast literature on the subject, will quietly disappear. All else will fade before the irresistible longing for reunion in Christ.

RELIG. PHILOS. : I must confess that I completely fail to follow you in this, for what you say is merely a different form of the same internationalism. The first to preach it in Russia were our Jesuits and people inclined to Catholicism—for instance, Chaadayev. They found a rather unexpected ally in Dostoyevsky in his commemorative speech on Pushkin, though Dostoyevsky was in general fully aware of the true value of Catholicism. After that the idea was taken up by Liberals, Marxists, and, finally, by present-day "Comrades." And you preach an inter-confessional brotherhood at the very moment when we must be most on our guard against such a treacherous foe.

REFUGEE : That is just the point : we must be on the watch, but in quite a different direction. The real foe is threatening both sides, and they are powerless owing to their dissensions.

RELIG. PHILOS. : Then, what is it you are seeking? Religious indifference, or the Unia, the "Catholicism of Eastern Rite" which is now so fashionable?

REFUGEE : Neither the one nor the other. I consider that at the present moment it is particularly important to hold to the Church, for nothing is now so heavily punished as religious instability. And for practical purposes I am, if you like, a churchman clinging to every syllable of orthodox teaching, for it is only from the depths of the life of the Church that the spirit of prophecy, the fulness of completion, can come; but not from sects or drawing-room meetings. We must hold fast to the Church, both in external discipline—experiments, such as V. Soloviev's, of an individual reunion of the churches by secretly embracing Catholicism, while remaining Orthodox, are inadmissible—and also in the sense of personal fidelity and active intense and searching love. This is exactly what the Slavophiles lacked, for, although chivalrously loyal to Orthodoxy they remained at the same time too calm and contented. And contentment is neither perfection or beatitude.

RELIG. PHILOS. : The religious neurasthenia that distinguishes

contemporary sectarians of the Khlyst kind, was certainly foreign to such staunch supporters of Orthodoxy as were Khomyakov¹ and other Slavophiles. I fancy that it is just Khomyakov's spirit that hovers over the Church Council and helps to keep it level-headed, stable and serenely clear-sighted.

REFUGEE: There is more truth in what you say than you yourself may suppose. But it only goes to prove my idea that the Council is, in something very essential, behind the times. For Khomyakov, together with all the Slavophiles, belongs to bygone days, to a period of history that is over. A firm standpoint, patriarchal customs, vigorous traditions—all these are shattered, as by an earthquake, and are being smelted and shaped anew by fire.

RELIG. PHILOS.: You speak of the Slavophiles as of a spiritual corpse that has not yet had time to decompose; and, in general, your attitude towards the historical Church seems to be almost blasphemous; I should prefer open enmity to your condescension. It is easier to deal with open enmity than with arbitrariness, sheltered under a cover of orthodoxy.

REFUGEE: How shall I answer? Declare an unlimited devotion to the Church? That would hardly be suitable. Still, it is precisely because orthodoxy is passing through a certain crisis that I take it to be vital. I believe, and with God's help shall believe to my last hour, that the truth of the Church is being guarded intact and entire in Eastern Orthodoxy, and that the Russian Church will shine forth with resplendent beauty and irresistible force. The light that will save the world will come from her. Also, my sense of history tells me that the Orthodox Church is the chief, and at the present moment, the only mainstay of Russian national and cultural self-consciousness, that all the best forces in the country must either directly or indirectly be devoted to her service, must base themselves on her. For that is the lesson that our grievous trials are teaching us: we must all gather around the Church, as dismembered Poland did around hers. The Russian Church has problems of enormous creative importance before her, for she must infuse grace into the Russian genius. However, I surmise that to accomplish this she must overcome her own exclusiveness and be as keenly sensible to the separation of the churches as if it were a wound on her living body. Ever since the fatal Xth century, something of priceless value has been lost both to West and East, something that can and must be found again.

¹ A. S. Khomyakov (1804-60), the eminent Slavophil philosopher, theologian and poet of the middle of the XIXth century.—ED.

RELIG. PHILOS. : And what part, may I ask, do you reserve for the Eastern Church, crippled, as you say, by the division of the churches? Merely an act of self-annulment through reunion, through dissolution in Romanism, which is even more dangerous and noxious than Germanism?

REFUGEE : The Russian Church, as no other local Church, is full of vague expectations and hungers for apocalyptic fulfilment. Russia—sinful, godless and dissolute as she is—will find strength in the last hour of history to make the prayer of the robber; she is still the country of holy miracles. The light of the world's transfiguration will shine forth through her.

DIPLOMAT : *Quod erat demonstrandum : inimicitiae temporales, amicitiae sempiternae*, a touching union of all Slavophil souls. God almighty! Is not everything that is happening sufficient to clear Russian minds of this Slavophil haziness? I sometimes think that this dreaminess is worse and more poisonous than even the socialistic delirium, for it affects our will, drives us to a contemplative quietism. It really seems as though only a German non-commissioned officer can kick this Eastern illusionment out of us and instil instead sound common sense. For herein lies the cause of the present crisis of Russia.

REFUGEE : Why do you harp on the fall of vanquished Russia and forget what is taking place all over the world? Are we not witnessing a general catastrophe, the collapse of "modern history"?

DIPLOMAT : Tragical exaggerations ought to be avoided. Europe has survived several crises, and come out regenerated. Normal life will regain its sway this time also, and in Russia as well. Only we must do away with Pugachev riots and sickly sentimentality.

REFUGEE : In my opinion the former way of life will never return; and it would be a senseless miscarriage of history were the old order simply restored. To cling at all cost to broken fragments is like holding on to the spars of a wreck. Comparative peace may come in Russia, but it would be a mere respite which ought to be made the most of. Our whole world is becoming one mass of flames, and there is no refuge to be found from the fury of the storm.

DIPLOMAT : The same kind of thing happens after every great war. Amateurs of eschatology, contemporary apocalyptics expected the end of the world after 1812. And the outcome then

was the Holy Alliance and the universal growth of capitalism. The same features will soon appear, and it is already fairly clear out of what elements the new order will be built.

REFUGEE : Every great war is indeed a symbol, a kind of historical rehearsal of a universal flood. And can any events in history equal the present in their scope and importance?

DIPLOMAT : Anyhow, they are as yet not universal. The yellow races have not been drawn into the struggle, it is not likely that they will soon join in, and India still stands apart. Europe will right herself, but will Russia?

REFUGEE : The time, in the early stages of the war, when we were compelled to emigrate from Poland, somehow comes back to my mind.¹ Rolling waves of the great transmigration of peoples preceded us. And I could not help thinking that soon everyone would feel more or less like a "refugee," driven out of his place, homeless and — free. The world in general is turning fugitive, and makes one revert to the immemorial anticipations of our "Runners."² Our intelligentsia, which you condemn, and which is, indeed, unsettled and graceless, possesses the fugitive instinct, the longing for an ideal city. If only their eyes were opened and they could understand what it is that they seek !

GENERAL : I am sorry, but you do the intelligentsia too great an honour in comparing them to the "Runners"; our intelligentsia are mere emigrants, schismatics; they have no sense of nationality, no feeling for the soil.

REFUGEE : You are right to a degree; but this will not stand for much in the final reckoning. Anyhow, the intelligentsia longs for something that the Transfiguration alone can give, although they, in their blindness, seek it in the revolution. This longing is a national one. The intelligentsia are babes in swaddling clothes; they are still in a state of childish rebellion, and they do not know themselves. But without them Russia—I even say the Russian Church—will not be able to fulfil her mission.

RELIG. PHILOS. : Good; but for the time being our intelli-

¹ Much of the Polish population was forcibly evacuated by the Russian Army during its retreat in the summer of 1915. These refugees, uprooted from all their moral and economic surroundings, in many cases had to travel as far as Siberia; large numbers of them have lately returned, infected with typhus and other epidemics.—ED.

² The Beguny were a very ancient sect, now non-existent. Its adherents renounced all earthly ties and callings to wander over Russia in search of a mystical ideal City of God.

gentsia is a most conservative class that clings, like the Old-Believers, to worn-out socialist tenets. As you say, the intelligentsia must fly from themselves; they must die worthily to rise again and bring forth fruit in abundance.

AUTHOR: Your idea of a coming epoch of general fugitivism appeals to me. The air is saturated with ozone from electrical discharges. Fear, even terror, assail you, but you rejoice as well; you are intoxicated and a certain giddiness overpowers you. It is rather like sailing in a fresh wind: the splash of the waves, their foam and spray, the taste of salt water, the sparkling sea and the swift motion take your breath away. You know that your light skiff may capsize at any time, and yet you feel inclined to sing, and shout, and play. Well, Pushkin explains it best:

Whatever brings the threat of death,
Has in itself for mortal hearts
A source of unsurpassed delight.

It is no idle play to live while great events are pending, but later generations in peaceful times will envy us, whom the gods have honoured with an invitation to their feast.

PUBLIC MAN: Yes, but in what garments have we come? Oh, my Russia, where are you? What care I for this feast of the gods, if Russia has come without her wedding garment and is cast out? What matter all these historical perspectives while Russia's decaying corpse lies before me? The universe is nothing without Russia, and I renounce its transfiguration if she is excluded. Dostoyevsky calls her "a woman arrayed with the sun"; only in Russia is the solemn night of Christ's resurrection celebrated. . . . If Russia is really lost, history has miscarried; it has fallen into a gaping abyss!

AUTHOR: Why seek the living among the dead? Why be of little faith? Our Russia lives and, as in days of yore, Christ treads it in a slave's reviled semblance, without form or comeliness. Not Blok's Christ "snow-clad and stepping in the storm," but the serene husbandman in his own sacred vineyard, who softly calls "Marya"—and soon, very soon, the soul of Russia will hear and fall at the feet of her Rabbi in an ecstasy of joy. . . . This hope, this belief, is all that is left to us; we have nothing else. But the soil of Russia knows, and it will save the people: the Mother of God has imprinted her footmarks on it. . . .

REFUGEE: Just before the October *coup d'état* an intimate friend confided an experience of his to me. With deep emotion

he told me that while he was in fervent prayer before a holy ikon of the Virgin, the words " Russia is saved " sounded quite clearly in his heart. How, why, wherefore, he could not say. But to forget the moment, to be disloyal to it, would have been for him the same as to reject something most sacred and real. And so, if my friend's experience is true, we must conclude that there is nothing to fear for Russia in the last sense of all, the sense that alone will count : for Russia is saved by the power of the Mother of God. And, believe me, Orthodox Russia knows this full well.

ALL (with the exception of the Diplomat) : Amen.

DIPLOMAT : ? ! ? !

PUBLIC MAN : Christ is risen !

ALL (with the exception of the Diplomat) : He is risen indeed !

SERGIUS BULGAKOV.

(*Translated by A. G. Pashkov.*)

POEMS.

AN EPISODE FROM PUSHKIN'S FAIRY TALES.

(Translated by Oliver Elton.)

By their window sat and spun
Maidens three; the day was done.
And the eldest maid was saying :
" Were I empress, I'd be laying
Out in state a banquet fine,
For the whole wide world to dine."
And the second maid was saying :
" Were I empress, I'd be laying
Linen out, and weave by hand,
For the whole world, every strand."
Then the youngest spoke, the other :
" Were I empress, I'd be mother
Of a hero; I would bear
Our dear emperor an heir."

Scarce that maid had ended speaking,
When the door went softly creaking,
And the emperor stept inside,
Lord of all that country wide.
All the while they were debating,
He behind the fence was waiting,
And the youngest sister's word
Pleased him best of all he heard.
" Beauteous maiden, happy meeting !
Be my queen ! " So ran his greeting.
" Bear me that same hero son
Ere September's out and done.
You, beloved sisters, quitting
This poor chamber, must be flitting
In my train, and follow now—
Follow, too, your sister. Thou
Chief of cooks, and thou, the second,
Chief of websters shalt be reckoned."

Out the people's father paced;
 To the palace all made haste.
 King Saltán, not long he tarried;
 On that eve the king was married.
 Noble was the feast; thereat
 With his youthful queen he sat.
 Then the nobler guests attended
 To a couch of ivory splendid
 Bride and bridegroom, young and fair.
 And alone they left them there.
 Cook, within the kitchen railing,
 Webster at the loom bewailing,
 Grudge the good things that befall
 Such a spouse imperial.
 But the lady, young and royal,
 To the word she gave was loyal,
 And that night became with child.

These were times of war, and wild.
 King Saltán, on point of parting,
 On his trusty charger starting,
 Bade his queen: "From every ill
 Keep thyself, and love me still."
 All the while that he was faring
 Far, and bloody battle daring,
 Drew the birth-hour near; and God
 Brought a boy—of two foot odd.
 With her babe the empress resting,
 Like a mother-eagle nesting,
 Sent a rider with a scroll
 To rejoice the father's soul.
 But, to compass her undoing,
 Cook and webster plots were brewing
 To forestall that messenger,—
 Barbarikha, dowager,
 Grandam, helping; and another
 Was despatched, with this: "The mother
 Yesternight gave birth to one
 Neither frog, nor mouse, nor son—
 No, nor daughter; but a creature
 Monstrous, new, and out of nature."

When the rider brought that word,
 And the people's father heard,

First he bade him hang, in passion;
 Bore himself in strangest fashion,
 Yet, for once relenting, gave
 These commands unto the slave:
 "Wait: the emperor, returning,
 Shall adjudge, by law and learning."

With the letter forth he passed,
 Rode, and got him home at last.
 Cook and webster and the other,
 Barbarikha, the queen-mother,
 Passed the word to ply him deep,
 Got him in a drunken sleep,
 Robbed his wallet of the writing,
 Planted one of their inditing.
 So that day the fuddled man
 Brought the order; thus it ran:
 "These, to our boyárs: Obey ye.
 Not an idle hour delay ye.
 Queen and brood fling privily
 In the bottomless deep sea."
 And the good boyárs, they failed not;
 Nought would serve; and grief availed not
 For their lord and mistress young.
 So into her room they flung,
 Told how both must meet disaster
 At the bidding of the master;
 Read the order out; anon
 Set the empress and her son
 In a barrel; and then thickly
 Tarred it over, rolled it quickly,
 Drove it duly forth to sea.
 "Thus he told us; thus do we."

In the blue sky stars are flashing;
 On the blue sea waves are lashing;
 Stormy cloud the sky bedims;
 On the sea the barrel swims.
 There the queen lies, weeping, straining,
 Like a woeful widow plaining.
 There, each hour, the child hath grown
 Fast as though a day were flown.
 Still, at eve, she wails; the surges
 Swifter still the infant urges:

" Wave, my wave, O boisterous wave !
 Thou, so free, art still my slave ;
 Wheresoe'er thou wilt thou splashest,
 Shingle upon shingle dashest,
 Flooding deep the sandy verge,
 Hoisting good ships on thy surge.
 I command thee, do not slay us ;
 On the dry land wash and lay us ! "
 There and then the obedient wave
 Gently to the foreshore drave
 Freight and barrel ; left them stranded ;
 Noiseless ebbd ; and they were landed.
 Prince and queen are safe ashore,
 And she feels the earth once more.
 — Who from out the cask shall take them ?
 Surely God will not forsake them ?
 On his feet the boy stands straight,
 At the bottom drives his pate,
 Gives a little heave, and asks then,
 " How are windows cut in casks, then,
 For escape ? "—without ado
 Bursts the bottom, and comes through.

Now the pair are free to wander.
 See, a champaign rises yonder
 To a hill with green oaks crowned,
 With the blue sea spanning round.
 But the son and heir was heedful,
 Holding a good supper needful ;
 Snapped an oaken branch, and so
 Bent it in a stubborn bow ;
 From his cross¹ a silk cord taking,
 Strung it on the bow, and breaking
 Short a slender reed, made right
 A good arrow, sharp and light.
 Then he went for quarry forward
 To the valley edges shoreward.

To the beach he scarce had gone,
 When he heard—was that a moan ?—
 Marked, upon the ruffled swell there,
 How an evil thing befell there.

¹ The cross which every Orthodox wears around his neck from a child,

Lo, a swan in desperate plight;
Overhead, a hanging kite.
She, poor bird, beats hard and splashes,
And the troubled water lishes;
He his needle-claws outflings
And his gory neb; then sings
All at once the arrow speeding,
Strikes his crop, and sends him bleeding
Out his life into the flow.
And the prince, with lowered bow,
Sees the creature sink and flutter
With a cry no bird could utter.
And the swan floats round, and still
Pecks that kite of wicked will,
Batters him with wing descending,
Drowns him, for a quicker ending.
Then to the tsarévich young
Speaks she in the Russian tongue:
"Thou, my prince, wert my salvation,
Mighty for my liberation.
Grieve not that because of me
Thy good shaft lies under sea,
Or that thou must fast to-morrow:
Sorrow proves not always sorrow.
Richly shalt thou be repaid,
And hereafter have my aid.
Saviour of a swan thou seemest,
But a maid to life redeemest;
With thy arrow thou didst smite
An enchanter, and no kite.
Know, that always I shall mind thee;
Be thou where thou mayst, I find thee.
Now, however, homeward get.
Go; sleep sound; no longer fret."

So flew off the swan enchanted.
Queen and prince held firm, and scanted,
Though a livelong day had passed;
Bedward went, nor broke their fast.
Next the prince, his eyes unclosing,
Shook away his dreams and dozing,
And behold! to his amaze,
A great city met his gaze.

White the walls were, and behind them
 Thick the battlements that lined them;
 Church and sacred convent there
 Sparkle, turreted in air.
 Quick the queen is roused and sighing
On! and *ah!* The prince is crying
 "Will the thing come true? I see,
 Pleasant is my swan with me."
 To the city both betake them,
 Cross the barrier; to make them
 Welcome, triply surge and swell
 Deafening chimes from every bell.
 And the folk flood out to meet them;
 Holy choirs praise God, and greet them;
 In gold chariots to the gate
 Comes the court in princely state.
 All men praise and honour loudly
 That tsarévich; crown him proudly
 With the royal cap; declare
 He is monarch of all there.
 License of the queen obtaining,
 On that day the prince is reigning
 In his capital; thereon
 Takes the title: *Prince Gvidón*.

Breezes on the water shifting
 Landward urge a vessel drifting,
 Bellying out her canvas brave
 As she skims along the wave.
 On the deck the shipmen teeming
 Wonder if awake or dreaming
 Such a marvel they behold
 On that island, known of old:—
 Strongly gated quays, and gilded
 Towers; a city newly builded!
 Cannon flaming from the quay
 Bid the ship put in from sea;
 And the strangers by the gateway
 Moor; the prince invites them straightway,
 Gives them food, gives drink; and then
 Thus makes question of the men:
 "Friends, what wares are ye exchanging?
 Whither may ye now be ranging?"

Then reply the shipmen stout :
" We have sailed the world about :
Now in sables we have traded,
Now in timbers dusky-shaded.
Past the island of Buyán,
To the realm of famed Saltán
Now due eastward we are wending.
Time is up ; our trip is ending."
" Happy journey, every man,
To the famous king Saltán
Over sea and ocean faring ! "
So the prince gave word, declaring :
" Do him reverence from me ! "
Then they went, and, gazing, he
Watched them far, beheld them vanish,
Sad with thoughts he might not banish.
Look ! the snowy swan, aswim
On the streaming wave, to him
Calls, " My lovely prince, good morrow !
Tell me, prince, whence comes thy sorrow ?
Why art thou so silent, say,
Downcast as a rainy day ! "
" I've a weary grief devouring,
All my manhood overpowering.
Would I might my father see ! "
Dolefully thus answered he.
But the swan said, " Art thou minded
To pursue the ship ? behind it
Flit, and be a midget, since
This is all thy woe, my prince."
Then she waved her wing, and scattered
Noisily the wave, and spattered
Him with spray from top to toe.
In a single instant, lo,
To a dot he shrank and minished,
Was a midge ; the change was finished.
Piping soft, away went he,
Caught the vessel on the sea,
Lighted gently, to discover
A good cranny, and took cover.

Past the island of Buyán,
To the realm of famed Saltán

Gaily onward runs the trader,
Gaily hums the breeze to aid her.
See, already looming nigher
Is the land of her desire !
Soon the strangers, newly landed,
To the palace are commanded,
And behind them to the king
Our adventurer takes wing.
There he sees, in gold all shining,
But with countenance repining,
Crowned and throned above them all,
King Saltán within his hall.
Cook and webster and the other,
Barbarikha, the queen-mother,
Pin their looks upon the king,
Sitting round him in a ring.
Then he calls the strangers; seats them
At his board; with question greets them :
" Strangers, masters; where go ye ?
Sailed ye long ? and over sea
Fared ye well ? Did harm beset you ?
In the world, what wonders met you ? "
Then replied the shipmen stout :
" We have sailed the world about.
Oversea no harm beset us ;
This the wonder was that met us :—
Once an island in the deep
Lay unpeopled, barren, steep,
Blank and level ; on it showing
Was a single oak-tree growing.
There to-day a city new
With a palace stands to view.
Golden-steepled churches cap it,
Towers arise, and gardens lap it
There sits prince Gvidón, and thence
Sends to thee his reverence "
At the tale astonished sorely,
" If I live," the king said, " surely
I will see that wondrous isle,
Have Gvidón my host awhile."
Cook and webster and the other,
Barbarikha, the queen-mother,
All were loth to let him so

To that isle of wonders go.
Said the cook, malignly winking
To her fellows, " We are thinking
That a city by the sea
Surely is a prodigy !
Hear of somewhat worth thy wonder :—
In a wood a pine, whereunder
Sings a squirrel rhyme on rhyme,
Nibbling filberts all the time.
Common nuts those nuts are not, sir ;
Each a golden shell has got, sir ;
Kernels, too, of emerald,
Which a wonder may be called."
King Saltán sat there, astounded ;
But the midge, in wrath unbounded,
At his auntie drove his sting,
In her right eye plunged the thing.
And that cook went pale, and wried her
Visage, swooning ; and beside her
Slave and sister, grandam too,
With a shriek the gnat pursue.
" Insect double-damned ! " they fidget,
" We will show thee . . . ! " but the midget
Calmly through the casement flees,
Flitting homeward overseas. . . .

OBITUARY.

JOSEF VÁCLAV MYSLBEK.

JOSEF VÁCLAV MYSLBEK, who died on 2 June last, may be called the founder of modern Czech sculpture. He not only created great works himself, but also educated a series of remarkable pupils. Like the father of modern Czech painting, Josef Mánes, like the first modern Czech poet, K. H. Mácha, and like the founder of modern Czech literature, Jan Neruda, he was born at Prague in the revolutionary year 1848. His parents, being poor, intended to give him such an education as could prepare him early to earn his own bread. When he left the lower classes of a secondary school, he was to be apprenticed to a printer. But he knew already that such a calling would not be in accordance with his own wishes, and asked his father, a suburban painter and decorator, to apprentice him to a sculptor who had something of a name at that time, but produced only works of indifferent merit. Thus he came into contact first with the handiwork and later with the art of sculpture.

He worked partly in Prague, partly in Vienna, where he made the acquaintance of Václav Levý, the first serious Czech sculptor of the century. Following his advice, he returned to Prague and spent several months in his studio, without however being influenced by the individuality of his master, a man and artist of a different type. Then he tried to enlarge his knowledge by some practical courses at the Academy of Arts, but as there was no teacher of sculpture at that time, he could only learn indirectly from those who taught æsthetics, drawing and painting. Several of his early productions attracted the attention of competent critics, and the builder of the National Theatre at Prague, the eminent architect J. Zíték, asked him to decorate one of the subordinate entrances with allegorical statues of Drama and Opera. These were the first achievements which made his name known to the public, and secured him some orders for the following years.

At the age of 25 he built a studio of his own, and began his arduous career of independence. His sound, robust personality

developed slowly, acquiring strength step by step, until it became visible to all, standing like a great oak-tree with its roots deep in reality and its mighty branches spreading under the blue sky of lofty ideas.

Viewed from the outside, his life appeared somewhat monotonous. No adventures made it romantic. The only external mile-stones which marked his course were his prizes, gold medals and other tokens of artistic success; his appointments as a professor of sculpture in the School of Applied Arts and later in the Academy of Arts, where he worked and taught up to 1919. In his private life he had to pass through many troubles, but in spite of them he kept his mind clear, his spirit strong, and his artistic ability intact.

When he began to work as a sculptor, there was in Bohemia virtually no living tradition in this branch of art. After a period of excellent masters, whose statues in the baroque style still decorate the churches and palaces of Prague and the famous old bridge of Charles IV., a time of artistic stagnation and decay followed, which did not produce any remarkable sculptor. The second part of the XVIIIth and the first part of the XIXth centuries were quite sterile in art. The first Czech sculptor of modern times who deserves the title of a born artist is Václav Levý (1820–1870) who accomplished notable works in the fifties and sixties, but whose talent and personality were not strong enough to influence greatly such a man as Myslbek. The only contemporary artist who could do so was the great painter, J. Mánes. He had created a new national style in Czech art, a new conception of the heroes of national legend as well as among those classes which preserved their national character amid the flood of Germanisation. This new conception coloured Myslbek's inspiration and fructified his imagination, especially when he produced the four groups which now stand on the Palacký Bridge at Prague. These four poems in stone form the most romantic episode in his whole work. All of them represent mythical heroes and heroines: Zábaj and Slavoj, two young comrades who have just defeated the enemy and have received, as their reward, a crown of lime-blossom; the mythical poet Lumír whose "words and song moved the Vyšehrad and the whole country"; the Czech Amazon Šárka whose beauty and cunning deprived the brave and knightly Ctirad of his life; and the mythical princess Libuša who, standing beside her husband, Přemysl the ploughman, on the top of the rocky Vyšehrad, sees in her mind the vision of Prague and prophesies its future

glory. But even in these works, in spite of all the romanticism of their subjects, which is partly visible in their execution, he preserved a classical moderation and simplicity, being more anxious to concentrate his artistic expression than to emphasise the emotional side of the stories which underlie his conceptions. He never liked the improvisation which characterises so many romantic artists and poets. Everything he produced was the result of long study and meditation, and of repeated attempts. A man of such qualities could not be an impressionist, though he lived at a time when impressionism flourished; he was a classicist in the best sense, because his own personality was such as to imbue his products with an inner superiority too great for any mere formalism.

This classical character is manifest especially in his decorative statues, as, for instance, in the beautiful Caryatids of marble which he made for the vestibule of one of the Prague savings banks, or in his Music, standing in the National Theatre at Prague—a girl of the Slavonic type, in a long gown, with down-cast eyes, a twig in her hair, and a simple musical instrument pressed to her bosom. It is true that such figures as these are rather too elegant and formal; but they are only a small part of his whole work, the main feature of which, besides the classical taste in execution, is a robust realism, based on a thorough study of living bodies and human characters.

A sound realism, connected with classical forms, he also found in the statues of French sculptors—Falguière, Frémiet, Chapu, Dubois, Barrias—whose works he studied during a brief visit to Paris in 1878. He fell in love with them, and praised them as masters even twenty or thirty years later when their art was overshadowed by his own. They were akin to him, and therefore their influence upon him in his early manhood exceeded that of all other modern sculptors. But later his own personality grew stronger, his knowledge of nature deeper and his art more powerful. Beside his best achievements, those of the French masters look rather academic and formal.

His vigorous realism changed even mere allegories into organic beings, living their own lives. Such are his "Firmness," a statue in marble, and his "Devotion," in bronze—the former, a young Roman legionary, a youthful, perfectly moulded form, ready to go firmly forward towards the goal he sees before him; the latter, an elderly Roman citizen in flowing robes, pointing with his right hand to his breast, as devoted as it is brave in the cause of the Roman Republic. The cheeks fallen, the eyes deep

in the sockets, the whole expression of the face concentrated in the manly spirit which fills the soul.¹

Realistic are also Myslbek's portraits of prominent men, executed mostly in the form of busts. A real monument and one of his highest achievements is his statue of Cardinal Schwarzenberg, the late Archbishop of Prague, who is represented kneeling and praying, not humbly, but with a quiet and firm confidence in God. The erect figure, the concentrated expression of the face, the folded hands, the arrangement of the vestments, combine to produce a simple, lofty and powerful impression. Two other works whose monumental character surpasses the rest, and, indeed, most others of modern sculpture, are his large Crucifixion and his St. Václav (Wenceslas). Both of them, like the kneeling Cardinal, are of bronze. One copy of the Crucifixion stands over an altar in the church of the Sacré Cœur on Montmartre, another in the Modern Gallery of Prague. His grief at the death of his beloved daughter, and the lasting impression of the sight of a drowned youth, were the emotional roots from which this great work grew. It is full of sadness. The dead body of the Christ hangs heavily on the cross, the muscles of the arms and chest are strained, the head, crowned with thorns, is bent downwards, the eyes and mouth are closed—all the features tell that suffering is finished. We see no sign in the face or in the pose of the body that the great thought for the sake of which He died remains victorious. And yet the grandeur of divinity rests on the bowed head of this dead Son of God.

The large monument of St. Wenceslas, which now stands in one of the main squares of Prague, might be easily called a work of Myslbek's whole life. For many years he planned it with the greatest care, making sketches and studies and changing his plans before he solved the problem to his satisfaction. In the end, he represented St. Wenceslas as a young prince, in his traditional mail shirt, cloak, and helmet, riding firm and contained down a slope as if at the head of his people. Four Czech saints are with him as champions of Christendom in Bohemia at this time: his grandmother, Ludmila, strangled only a few years before his death; St. Prokop, who founded the old Slavonic

¹ It was this statue which made the name of its author known beyond the frontiers of Bohemia. When it was exhibited in Vienna in 1884, the jury did not allot it the prize, although it was the best work at the exhibition. A few days later the young artists of Vienna laid a crown of laurel at its feet with "*Gloria victis!*" inscribed in gold upon the red ribbon fastened to the laurel.

monastery in Sázava; St. Anežka (Agnes), who came of the same family as Prince Václav, and the second Bishop of Prague, St. Vojtěch (Adalbert), who was killed by the Prussians at the end of the tenth century. A word about the stallion which the Prince is riding. The whole body, instinct with movement, could only have been produced by long observation and study. Nature itself seems to break through it, but a nature ennobled by supreme art. As in other works of Myslbek, we feel the inner fervour of the artist behind the material forms, we feel the spiritual glow without which no sense of beauty, no exquisite taste can infuse life into the dead stone and metal of which the statues are made. For it is only a great personality whose genius is on fire, that can produce great art.

F. CHUDOBA.

ALOIS RAŠÍN.

THE Czechs and Slovaks can point with pride to the fact that their goal of independence was attained without a single one of those acts of political terrorism which have marked the history of many a once subject nationality. But early in the fifth year of the new Republic the hand of the assassin has claimed its victim; and the death of Dr. Rašín, on 18 February, 1923, after a brave struggle of six weeks against the paralysis induced by a bullet in the spine, is a loss not merely to Czechoslovakia, but to the whole financial world of Europe.

Alois Rašín was born near Hradec Králové (Königgrätz) in North-west Bohemia on 18 October, 1867, and after studying law at Prague University, took his doctorate in 1891. Almost from the first his name figured prominently among the more irreconcilable and anti-Austrian of the younger generation; and in February, 1893, he was one of the ringleaders in the famous Omladina Trial. In this monster case a charge of treason was brought against seventy-seven students, journalists and workmen (for the most part between the ages of seventeen and twenty-two) who, it was alleged, were planning a secret society on lines similar to the Italian Carbonari, and with the same subversive and anti-dynastic aims. Almost all the accused received sentences varying from three years to four months, and, among them, Rašín was deprived of his doctor's diploma and sent to prison for two years. When an amnesty was granted by the Badeni Government in 1895, he only had five days of his term of imprisonment still to run.

Rašín left prison embittered, and a declared enemy of Habsburg rule. He began to practise as advocate, but drifted steadily into journalism and politics, and in 1911 was elected as a deputy of the Young Czech Party in the Austrian Reichsrat. When the war came, he stood at once in the forefront of Czech passive resistance: his old self from the days of the Omladina was re-awakened, and, realising that this time the nation had reached the supreme crisis of its fate, he set himself in real earnest to build up the organisation which at a later stage came to be known as the "Maffia." But he was already a marked man, and in June, 1915, was thrown into prison, in conjunction with the Young Czech leader, Dr. Kramář. After the usual long delays they were brought before a military court in Vienna, and in 1916 were sentenced to death for high treason. As in the Middle Ages heretics were degraded from the priesthood and false knights had their spurs hacked from their heels, so now an absurdly superfluous decision stripped Rašín for the second time of his doctorate. But the Austrian authorities hesitated to carry out the sentence, though Rašín on his side obstinately refused to sign a petition to the Crown for mercy. In May, 1917, after two years' confinement, he benefited by the political amnesty proclaimed in Austria (but not in Hungary) by the Emperor Charles, and returned to Prague, where, though remaining necessarily in the background, and deprived of his seat in Parliament, he became one of the moving spirits of the Maffia. On 6 January, 1918, a meeting of all the Czech deputies (both active and deprived) to the Reichsrat and local Diets, was held at Prague; and it was Rašín who drafted the resolutions which it then passed, re-affirming in a still more unequivocal form the programme of Czechoslovak independence which had first been proclaimed in the Reichsrat on 30 May, 1917. These resolutions were quite logically denounced by the Austrian Premier, Dr. von Seidler, as "tending to dissolve the existing state"; but he was on weaker ground when he arrogantly dismissed them as "a mere aberration, only explicable as a kind of war-psychosis." Not long after, Count Czernin, as Joint Foreign Minister, launched a philippic against "the miserable Masaryk." But Rašín and his colleagues continued their activities undismayed, and, keeping step with their colleagues of the National Council in Paris, London and Washington, matured their plans for the final crisis. In the closing days of October, when Dr. Lammasch had accepted the post of Austrian Premier in order to "liquidate" the crumbling Monarchy, most of the Czech political leaders took advantage of his permission to proceed

to Switzerland to meet and consult with Dr. Beneš, who had already secured the Entente's recognition for a provisional Czechoslovak Government. Rašín remained behind in Prague, and saved the situation by his prompt and energetic action, on 28 October, in proclaiming the Republic and effecting a bloodless transfer of power to the revolutionary National Council. The Manifesto addressed to the nation on this occasion came from his pen. It is only right to add that by his uncompromising attitude in these days of crisis he repelled the German Bohemian leaders at a moment of depression when they might have come to terms, and so helped to plunge them into that attitude of obstinate and niggling doctrinairism which has characterised them ever since. Rašín, indeed, was quite typical of the Young Czech Party—essentially *bourgeois* in outlook, not too tolerant in racial matters and eager enough to show the German extremists that two could play at their game. But what he lacked in breadth of vision and charm of manner, he made up for in intensity and application and in a wholehearted devotion to duty.

As Finance Minister in the Coalition Cabinet of all parties, formed under Dr. Kramář on 14 November, 1918, he played a part which was to be absolutely decisive for the fate of the new Republic. He it was who devised, and carried through, the bold and difficult policy of separating the Czechoslovak currency from that of the old Austria. The President of the Chamber, in his estimate of Rašín's career, expressed but the bare truth when he described this work as one "which at first did not command general confidence, and which was watched both at home and abroad with breathless anxiety." It was, however, crowned with complete success, and won the almost unstinted recognition even of his most pronounced political and national opponents. Only a financial expert can do justice to the long series of his financial reforms: in this place it must suffice to mention the restamping of the Austro-Hungarian banknotes pending a new issue (on lines subsequently followed by the other Succession states), the device for withdrawing superfluous paper from circulation, the "Liberty Loan," the first provisional Budget, the measures for consolidating the Bourse of Prague, the levy on capital, the erection of the Bank Office and the Postal Cheque Office, and the creation of the so-called "Devisenzentrale." Before he left office in July, 1919, the main lines of Czechoslovak financial policy had been definitely laid: and no one man contributed more than he towards winning for his country the confidence of financial circles, alike in Europe and America—a confidence which is expressed

in the fact that to-day the Czechoslovak crown stands at less than 160 to the £ sterling, as compared with 320,000 in Vienna, 95,000 in Berlin, 200,000 in Warsaw, 450 in Belgrade, and 1,000 in Bucharest. From 1919 he remained out of office until October, 1922, when he again became Finance Minister, this time in the Švehla Cabinet. The outrage which cost him his life was the work of a young bank clerk under twenty, who would appear to have been infected by Communist doctrines.

As Rašín lay dying, he was asked to send a message to his colleagues in the Cabinet. "Tell them," he said, speaking with increasing difficulty, "tell them to remain what they are.... Always to tell the truth.... If we hold together we shall keep our independence.... If we separate, we shall lose it." And then, after a little silence, "politics are terribly.... hard.... we are all responsible for the fate of the Fatherland.... The politician must tell the truth.... without reserve.... If we don't know how to speak the truth even to ourselves.... we lose.... we lose our independence.... I am an optimist.... I believe that there will be more of us, of that mind.... Sometimes one must keep silent as to the truth.... if the people cannot bear it.... one must wait for the right moment.... but then tell it unreservedly, and do it quick.... quick!" These were his last words.

In many ways Dr. Rašín was typical of the nation to whose achievement of independence he contributed so valiantly. The true Czech, despite a genuinely artistic temperament, cares little for those arts and graces which are so valuable an aid to propaganda: but he has the solid and sterling qualities of self-reliance and endurance, which win through to success. Such a man was Rašín. In the words of President Masaryk, "he was not only a strong character, but a close and loyal friend and comrade, open to the arguments even of his enemies. He was a truly Czech man—simple, hardworking, a man of steel, a man of heart."

R. W. SETON-WATSON.

ANTONÍN KALINA.

ONLY a few weeks before the murderous attack upon Rašín the Czechs lost another prominent member of the former Maffia. Antonín Kalina was born on 16 June, 1870, in the little town of Německý Brod (Deutschbrod), where his father was Mayor. He was a characteristic product of the *petite bourgeoisie* of the provinces, which, at the turn of the century, was to prove the back-

bone of the Czech national movement in its later phase. After completing his legal studies, he became an official in the tiny town of Blatná, and soon distinguished himself throughout the district of Písek as a master of that national *Kleinarbeit* ("miniature work," we may aptly call it) which was then going on in every part of Bohemia, and without which the fabric of independence could not have been erected. In 1907 he was returned at the first Reichsrat elections under universal suffrage as a member of the Czech Radical Party. This new and growing group left the Young Czechs far behind in its superpatriotic fervour, and the crude methods of parliamentary obstruction which it habitually practised cannot be said to have impressed the outside world. But Kalina, unlike most of his comrades in the party, was no mere shouter, or hurler of ink-pots. Though he laid, perhaps, undue stress on the historic "State Rights" of Bohemia, and slurred over the contradiction which undoubtedly exists between them and the pure doctrine of national unity, his radicalism was thoroughly genuine, and rested upon principles and ideals no less surely than the "realism" of Masaryk, for whom, both as a student and a grown man, he always had the warmest regard. In the opening years of the war he chafed under the policy of passivity which the Czech leaders perforce adopted, and when, at the re-opening of the Austrian Parliament (30 May, 1917) the various nationalities lodged their claims of unity and self-determination, but left a side-door open for reconciliation with the Habsburg Monarchy, Kalina did not hesitate to make a public declaration of his own in favour of the full programme of independence. For the rest of the war he belonged to the inner ring of the Maffia, and was known to the Czech National Council abroad as especially discreet and trustworthy.

Under the new Republic he was, of course, a member of the first Assembly, but was ere long selected by President Masaryk for the post of Czechoslovak Minister in Belgrade. This appointment surprised many, but was amply justified. Kalina was a man of frail physique and of most unassuming manners—anything but the typical diplomat. But while free from the trammels of diplomatic precedent, he possessed that essential tact which rests on sympathy and knowledge, and is more important than external form; and to this he added clear thinking and an infectious enthusiasm for the Slavonic cause. As a member of the Reichsrat he had been known for his keen sympathy with the Southern Slavs, and he now became one of the most invaluable exponents of a close *entente* between Czechoslovakia

and Yugoslavia. No one did more than he to translate into reality the policy of the Little Entente between these two countries and Roumania, as envisaged by President Masaryk and Dr. Beneš. His premature death, as the result of a long and painful illness, removes one of the most sympathetic figures in recent Czech politics.

R. W. SETON-WATSON.

THE BISHOP OF STARA ZAGORA.

MONSIGNOR METHODIUS, METROPOLITAN OF STARA ZAGORA, who died in November 1922, was certainly the most picturesque figure among the few survivors of the Bulgarian liberationist movement. Some twenty years ago it was my privilege to spend a couple of days with him, and nothing has dimmed the memory of his personality and of his strange, brilliant talk. His appearance was that of an ascetic: a spare figure in black monk's robes, and below the tall black headdress a pallid face with aquiline features, silver beard and penetrating dark eyes; but there was nothing of the typical Eastern ecclesiastic in the wit and gaiety and frankness of his talk, the swiftness of his movements and the intense vitality which animated all that he said and did. He was intensely alive, but the life he was then living was scarcely on this plane, nor was it altogether a conventionally religious life. He saw visions and communed much with the spirits of those who had gone; but the past, with its struggles and passions, still remained clear to him. It had been his lot to render special services to his own people more than once, and the story of his life is not without interest.

Todor Kusev—his name in the world—was born in 1838 at Prilep in Macedonia, where he was educated in the Greek section of a mixed school, and later he was apprenticed to a tailor in his native town. Before he was twenty, he had already become the leader of a group of young Bulgarian patriots, who ultimately succeeded in expelling the Greek Bishop from Prilep and in regaining their own Church and schools there. In 1870 came the establishment of the Exarchate. It was Todor Kusev who, as one of the self-appointed delegates from Macedonia to the first National Council of the Bulgarian Church, forced his way uninvited into the Council Chamber. There his fiery eloquence, in the words of a fellow countryman, "greatly troubled the Assembly," and forced them to the decision that the Bulgars of Macedonia had the same right to representation at the National

Council as those who lived to the north of the Rhodope—a decision which was to have far-reaching consequences. In 1873, Kusev became a Deacon and soon after went as Archimandrite to Plovdiv (Philippopolis), where he was in close touch with those who were planning an insurrection against the Turks. It was he who in 1876 first brought the news of the Batak massacres to Constantinople, carrying with him, concealed in his stockings, strips of paper on which were written details of what had happened. These papers he took first to the American professors of Robert College, imploring their help for his countrymen, and, through them, the story reached Edwin Pears, correspondent of the *Daily News*, who was the first among the foreign authorities at Constantinople to credit and to make known to the world the story of the “Bulgarian Atrocities.” During the Russo-Turkish war, the Exarch moved to Plovdiv for safety; in 1880, he sent the Archimandrite to Constantinople to act as his *locum tenens*. While there, Methodius, who to the end of his days retained his ardent Macedonian sympathies, set about the reorganisation of the Bulgarian schools in Macedonia and Thrace, borrowing for the purpose a large sum of money from his compatriots on his own responsibility. Early in the reign of Prince Alexander of Battenberg, the Bulgars forfeited the favour of Russia; and Russia, with a view to limiting the jurisdiction of the Exarch and thwarting Bulgarian ambitions for national reunion, opposed the return of the Exarch to Constantinople. Methodius who recognised that, unless the Exarch were at Constantinople, the Bulgars still under Turkish rule would lose the protection and status for which they had fought for generations, did not hesitate to overcome the Russian opposition by using the familiar threat of a general secession of the Bulgarian Church to Rome, and by preparing the way for the step. When he was fifty years old, Methodius, on the advice of the Exarch Joseph, went to Russia to finish his theological studies, and spent five years at Kiev and St. Petersburg. Soon after his return he was elected Metropolitan of Stara Zagora. Perhaps the chief memorial there of his long Episcopate will always be the transformation of a bare hillside into a public garden such as Easterns love, with roses and fruit trees and fountains—a work which was carried out under his own direction. As he grew older the charge of the finance and business of his diocese became too heavy for him, but he will long be remembered in Bulgaria for the eloquence which, in Mr. Simon Radev’s words, shook the Bulgarian Church out of its torpor.

ELLINOR F. B. GROGAN.

IVAN TAVČAR.

By the death of Dr. Ivan Tavčar on 20 February, Jugoslavia, and Slovenia in particular, has lost one of the most striking figures in public life. Dr. Tavčar was a brilliant speaker, successful in politics, a famous author, an admirable journalist and stylist—beyond all doubt one of the best sons of the Slovene people. But what before all things else gained for him the sympathy of the whole people, friends and opponents alike, was the sterling integrity of his character, contrasting sharply—especially in these days—with so much in the world around him. He was frank to bluntness, honest and upright as Aristides, and a resolute enemy of all demagoguery. When once he held an idea to be right, he championed it to the uttermost, regardless of the world's opinion, contemptuous of public favour. But just for this reason he always commanded the respect of the plain man, who knew that Dr. Tavčar's opinion invariably represented the opinion of an educated, honest, and capable man. How high was the esteem in which he was held by the whole nation showed most clearly in the obituaries which appeared in the press after his death. The gist of every article was that Slovenia had rarely had cause to mourn so excellent a son.

Dr. Tavčar's greatest political achievements are the foundation of Slovene Liberalism, and the obstinate struggle with the Germans and the Austrian Government, whereby he saved the towns of Carniola from Germanisation. In the field of popular education and enlightenment he especially distinguished himself. A lawyer by profession, he realised to the full the harmfulness of the Slovene peasant's passion for litigation, and to mitigate this evil he wrote the truly monumental work, *The Slovene Jurist*, for the peasant. This book—some 80,000 copies of which have been sold among a nation numbering only one million and a half—has become the common household property of the Slovene people and saved them millions of crowns. He was an energetic champion of spiritual emancipation of the people in other respects as well; his fight against clericalism split the country into two camps, but it initiated the free development of the nation.

But far more than Tavčar the politician, Tavčar the novelist and author deserves mention. His novels are pearls of true poetry, and are already counted as classic Slovene literature.

The subjects of his novels he sought in the history of his own people, which he embroidered with poetical imagery and

skill. It is remarkable that Tavčar's best literary work was done towards the close of his busy life. His *Flowers in Autumn* (Cvetje v jeseni) and *Chronicles of Visoko* (Visoška kronika) are worthy of being translated into every foreign language, because of the freshness of the sentiment and the charm of expression.

Unfortunately, when the day of liberation dawned for his country, Dr Tavčar, who had done more than most to prepare the people for that day, could do no more than advise and inspire. He was already the victim of the terrible and incurable disease of which he finally died, after four years' martyrdom heroically borne.

A. ŽELEZNIKAR.

JAN URBAN JARNÍK.

JAN URBAN JARNÍK, who died in Prague on 13 January, was the first professor of Romance philology at the Czech University of Prague, whither he came from Vienna in 1882. It was in Paris that he first became attracted to the subject which was to become his leading passion, namely the study of the language and nation which lie on the border-line of the Slavonic and Romance world. The composite Roumanian nation, which has been so profoundly influenced by ancient Slavonic civilisation, offers a field of interest not only for the philologist but also for the student of Slavonic law. Jarník was admirably equipped for this work, having a knowledge of all the various ingredients of the language—Slav, Magyar, Turkish, Modern Greek, Albanian—and perhaps no other foreign scholar has shown so keen an appreciation for the expressive and racy language of the Roumanian peasantry. He was from the first an enthusiastic student of popular idioms, as revealed in the rich treasury of Roumanian folklore and popular proverbs, and showed an amazing command of detail when interpreting folk songs or fairy tales to his students. Next to his mother-tongue, Roumanian was the language which he spoke best, and he may fairly claim a place in Roumanian literature; for he wrote many articles and pamphlets in that language, and his translations from the Czech are quoted in the great dictionary of Tietin. Some have thought that he laid undue stress upon dialect peculiarities, but his answer was that some good Roumanian writers did the same. He was an opponent of those purists who in their ambition to make the Roumanian language thoroughly Roman, pronounced a ban against many words long since assimilated by

the language, and in their place introduced superfluous French, Italian and Latin words for which there were good vernacular equivalents — failing to realise that Roumanian, though its structure is distinctly Latin, is, and will always remain, a mixed language, like English. In his vindication of the vernacular against this school of thought, Professor Jarník found a powerful ally in Titu Maiorescu. He collected much valuable material for the monumental dictionary edited by the Roumanian Academy, of which he was one of the first corresponding members. His criticisms of the Roumanian section of the well-known grammar of Romance languages by W. Meyer-Lübke, revealed a serious gap in the latter's equipment.

Jarník lived long enough to witness the rise of "Great Roumania" and the formation of the Little Entente. He helped to found a Czecho-Roumanian Society in Prague; and lectureships in Roumanian both at Prague and Bratislava Universities are held by his former pupils. He founded the Czechoslovak Students' League (1904), and, himself of humble extraction, became a real father to poor students. Though an indefatigable worker, he found time for social welfare work, and during the war did much to befriend wounded Roumanian soldiers in Prague. Potštýn (Pottenstein), the small mountain village where he was born in 1848, has become a well-known summer resort, chiefly owing to the charm of his bright and sociable personality.

O. VOČADLO.

CHRONICLE NOTES

A.—RUSSIA.

LENIN'S illness has taken a very serious turn. Specialists have again been summoned from Germany, and the Soviet Government have been issuing daily bulletins. Last spring Lenin had an apoplectic stroke. He rested for six months in the country near Moscow, and by October he had so far recovered that he took part in the work of government, though not with the same energy and resource as before. These efforts to work were followed by a relapse; the physicians strictly limited Lenin's activities, but at the end of February he had another stroke, in consequence of which he lost the use of his right arm and right leg, while his speech was also affected. It seems improbable that he will recover, and in any case it is out of the question that he should resume the conduct of the affairs of the Soviet Government. A triumvirate, consisting of Kamenev, Rykov and Stalin, has been appointed to act as a directing body. Kamenev is a mediocre individual, without any pronounced views; he is supposed to represent the middle element between the extremists and the moderates. Rykov has for a long time past advocated a return to capitalist methods; he is to be regarded as a moderate. Stalin (Jugashvili), a Georgian, has been particularly intimate with Lenin and is supposed to know, and to sympathise with, his real mind more fully than the other leaders of the Communist Party.

What difference the disappearance of Lenin will make it is difficult to say. Probably there will be few immediate changes in the policy pursued during the last year when Lenin, in fact, took a very small part in the direction of affairs. Lenin, however, enjoyed a very great personal authority, and the lack of that authority may be felt.

A new Civil Code, drawn up by the Soviet Government, came into force on 1 January. The first article declares: "Civil rights are protected by the law, except in cases where they are effectuated in contradiction to their social and economic purpose."

The rest of the code, with its partial reproduction of provisions of the former code, coupled with curious restrictions dictated by the needs and purposes of the Soviet despotism, is framed throughout in the spirit of the first article. It is a grudging official recognition of the state of affairs created by the New Economic Policy. It is important that it does to a certain extent recognise property

rights and contracts and provides for the settlement of disputes over property in courts of law.

Big industry is still fettered by the State and is in a wretched condition. Internal trade, which is freed to a large extent, is making progress, though it is hampered by the financial confusion. The general tendency is to leave economic enterprise more and more to private initiative.

While the economic despotism of the Bolshevists is gradually relaxing, their political despotism is being systematically asserted. Their Communist propaganda is more active than ever. They maintain their anti-religious campaign. At Christmas time the Union of Communist Youth carried out in all the chief towns processions representing a vile and disgusting parody on all forms of religion. The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Petrograd and fourteen Roman Catholic priests have been arrested and brought up for trial. The Patriarch Tikhon is to be brought up for trial shortly. The Soviet Government is strengthening its hold on the Universities and trying to make them vehicles for the dissemination of Communist ideas. This unabated zeal for Communist theory, side by side with an enforced abandonment of Communist practice, is characteristic of the present transitional stage.

The Bolsheviks were represented at the Lausanne Conference by Chicherin and Rakovsky, who took part in the discussion on the Straits. Their proposal that no foreign warships should be admitted to the Black Sea was rejected both by the Allies and by the Turks. A certain number of anti-Bolshevik Russians took up, in the Russian press abroad, the attitude that in this matter at least the Bolsheviks defended the real interests of Russia, while others pointed out that the permanent closure of the Black Sea to foreign warships could only be regarded as a Russian interest if it were assumed that antagonism between Russia and England must be regarded as a permanent factor in history.

B.—POLAND.

The Two Polish Presidents.

After four years' work of the Constituent Assembly, the foundations for regular parliamentary life in Poland had been laid, and the elections for the first two-chamber parliament were held at about the same time as the general election in England.

They brought no great surprises. The *bloc* of the Right and the *bloc* of the Left came out of them almost equal in strength, as they had been in the Constituent Assembly. Owing to the formation, for electioneering purposes, of a *bloc* of the national minorities, with the United Jews as its strongest element, the national minority representation considerably gained in strength, amounting to nearly

one-fourth of the Lower House. Finally, the attempt to create a parliamentary Centre, chiefly out of representatives of the educated middle class, broke down completely. The country voted on strictly party lines, and the only social class represented in the new parliament by a strong party of their own—the strongest of all—are the peasant farmers.

The first task of the two Chambers was to elect a President of the Republic, and the fierceness of party warfare during the election campaign gave reason to anticipate a heated contest. It seemed at first, however, that its heat would be somewhat abated by the absence of the two most marked personalities from the field: Mr. Dmowski, the uncrowned king of the Right, did not emerge from his provincial retirement even on this occasion, and seems to have given up political activities entirely. On the other hand, Marshal Piłsudski, put forward unanimously as the candidate of the parties of the Left, saw fit to withdraw his candidature in view of the party passions which had lately raged round his person and his policy.

This made it difficult to find a candidate sufficiently prominent to secure a large measure of agreement among parliamentary groups. It is very much to be regretted that universal support could not be obtained, either at the first election or at the second, for the candidature of Professor Casimir Morawski, the President of the Polish Academy, whose illustrious person, respected throughout the country, would have worthily filled the position, and whose noble sense of citizenship would have been a constant example to the wrangling party leaders. But Professor Morawski has never been an active politician in the strict sense of the word, and the lessons he draws from the Greek and the Roman world for modern use are too remote from the muddled civic consciousness of a seething post-war democracy to command popularity.

The candidate of the Right, Count Maurice Zamoyski, the Polish Ambassador in Paris, and a descendant of Poland's greatest statesman in the glorious Renaissance period, was unacceptable, for obvious reasons, to the democratic parties of the Left. The strength of the national minorities in parliament gave them a casting vote, and their sympathies on important issues being naturally with the Left against the strenuously nationalist Right, it happened that the modest person of Mr. Gabriel Narutowicz, formerly Minister of Public Works and lately Minister for Foreign Affairs, was raised, against his wish, to the high position of first President of the Polish Republic under the new Constitution of 1921.

Now M. Narutowicz, however unassuming, would not have failed in representative dignity in this exalted station. He was an engineering specialist of world-wide reputation, known in many European countries, from Russia to Spain. He has held a chair of Engineering in the Polytechnic High School of Zurich and his knowledge and experience had thrown helpful light on many a great

economic problem in Poland even before the war. Like his friend Piłsudski, he was descended from the ardently patriotic country gentry of the north-eastern borderlands of the old Polish Monarchy (Lithuania and Samogitia), which has given to Poland many a national hero and leader from Kościuszko, in the period of the partitions, to Traugutt in the desperate insurrection of 1863; and many a great man in fields of art and thought, from Mickiewicz, the poet, to Moniuszko, the musician, and Siemiradzki, the painter. Narutowicz had acted in the best spirit of his class when, on the rise of the new Poland, he had abandoned his brilliant career as a specialist abroad and devoted his energies to the service of the Polish State. His past seemed to warrant the hope that under his Presidency the best forces of Poland would be directed into channels of peaceful reconstruction, economic progress, and technical development.

These characteristics of the first President of Poland are sufficient to help any foreign reader to realise the shock felt by every Pole when, only a few days after his election, President Narutowicz was murdered by a fanatic whose morbid brain had been set on fire by a most unpatriotic campaign of the Parties of the Right and their press against the new Head of the State. All Europe, after the Great War, is a welter of unsettled morality, social restlessness, and political violence. Still, the fact remains that, for the first time in Polish history, at this extremely critical moment, the sacred person of the Chief of State has fallen by the hand of a fellow-citizen.

At first it seemed that chaos would assume sway. Anarchy was in the air. For once, however, the nation successfully weathered a most threatening storm. Only a very few hours after the murder, the reins of government were taken in hand temporarily by General Sikorski, well remembered as one of the very few military leaders who succeeded, in 1920, in maintaining order and discipline among their army groups during the retreat before the flood of Bolshevik invasion. He has succeeded again in stemming panic and lawlessness, and at the present moment it can be said without irony, and in a different sense from the historic phrase, that *l'ordre règne à Varsovie*.

The new Presidential election has carried another candidate of the Left into power, but, unlike the first, he has been received by the Parties of the Right with assurances of respect and accents of conciliation. Mr. Stanislas Wojciechowski, to an even greater extent than Narutowicz, is a man of the Piłsudski type and generation. Like Piłsudski himself, he was engaged, in the revolutionary atmosphere of pre-war Russian Poland, in conspirator's work among the industrial working class on behalf of the National Socialist Party. He was hunted out of his country by the Tsar's police, threatened by it even in Paris, and, like many other European revolutionaries, found shelter, for a time, on the hospitable soil of England, where he worked as a printer. Like Narutowicz, he has recently been known chiefly for activities which characterise him as a promoter of peaceful economic

reconstruction. Above all, he is Poland's foremost organiser of the co-operative movement, and lectured on the subject in one of the higher schools of Warsaw. Like Narutowicz again, he has never been in the forefront of party strife—even at the time when he was at the head of the Polish Home Office—and this partly accounts for his good reception by the Opposition. Besides he was, at some points of his career, in distinct political sympathy and in actual touch with the Nationalists of the Dmowski camp, and he both won and deserved golden opinions from them by resolutely advocating, during his stay in Moscow in 1917 and 1918, the formation of a Polish Army in Russia, to fight for the cause of the Allies.

Thus, the person of the new President may well be greeted as an element of peace, calm and mediation in the political excitement of Poland. But it cannot be denied that the recklessness of party warfare has seriously hampered, especially in recent times, the ordered progress of the new Republic towards consolidation and economic strength. True, the trade balance of the country during the most stormy period of the elections steadily approached a level of equality; the final trade statistics for 1922 even show a total surplus of 30,000,000 gold francs in the value of exports over imports. But the currency has, for all that, been steadily gliding down the inclined plane towards catastrophe, and General Sikorski rightly sees in financial reform his first and principal administrative task. He convoked a conference of all Poland's former Finance Ministers—some of them very distinguished experts—for the purpose; but many of its recommendations are really "counsels of perfection."

The stabilisation of Polish finance can only find a firm basis in strenuous taxation. In this, as in many other vital questions, everything will again depend on the attitude of the strongest party in parliament and the strongest element in the country—the *peasants*. With that shrewd tactician, M. Witos, still at their head, they have not, it must be admitted, behaved during the late complications with the consistency and resolution which must be required of a political group of such power and such responsibilities. The question whether they will continue to side loosely with the Left or form a solid *bloc* with the Right, has all along been open; and the negotiations opened with them by the parties of the Right, with the avowed aim of forming a "purely Polish" majority, have so far failed to produce a compromise between the peasants' greed for more land and the die-hard landlords' stubborn conservatism.

One thing is certain: the formation of a working parliamentary majority—of which the "People's Party" must be the determining component—is the only condition of any definite government programme of Polish policy being formed and realised—a consummation devoutly to be wished, whatever the complexion of the final programme.

And another thing is equally clear: now that the Reparations problem has produced a most acute European crisis, the hand on the

clock of Poland's international destinies is approaching the hour of twelve, and Poland's "elder statesmen" ought to realise more clearly than ever that God will only help those who help themselves.

A POLISH CORRESPONDENT.

Professor Dyboski's work in England.

A more serious study of Polish life and literature has been specially desirable in England, in view of the little that has been done in this subject, and a consequent prevailing ignorance even as to essential facts. The University of Cracow, on the representation of the Polish Academy of Sciences, arranged for Professor Roman Dyboski, Professor of English Literature, and probably the best known living Polish authority on the subject, to spend the greater part of this session in England. It was peculiarly apposite to the work of a School of Slavonic Studies in a non-Slavonic country that Professor Dyboski has many ties with other Slavonic countries, and in particular has spent so much time in Russia. His vigorous and able help has everywhere made itself felt, and he has taken position as one of the most forcible and effective lecturers in English to be heard in London. He has delivered at King's College two courses of public lectures, of seven and eight lectures respectively, on Polish Literature, and will next term give an outline of Polish History in eight lectures. But he has also lectured far and wide in Great Britain, delivering the four Ilchester Lectures of the Taylorian Institution at Oxford on Periods of Polish History, and lecturing at the Universities of Cambridge and Liverpool, at the League of Nations Union, at the London Chamber of Commerce, at the London School of Economics and Political Science in London University, at the City of London College, at the Wakefield Street Institute, at the Jewish Institute, at the To-Morrow Club and elsewhere. Meanwhile his work has been invaluable to this review in the securing and translating of articles from eminent Polish scholars, and in articles and in other individual work of his own, which have provided the editors with a valuable reserve for the future. Notices in several of the more authoritative newspapers and magazines have testified to the better appreciation of Polish problems which has resulted from Professor Dyboski's work. The *Review of Reviews*, for instance, says: "It will be seen that Nitti, in his *Europa senza Pace*, was more impressed with what needed to be done (in Poland) than well informed as to what was being attempted."

C.—CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

While the political situation throughout Central and Eastern Europe is increasingly unstable and seems to resemble a vast moving bog, Czechoslovakia continues to remain a relatively bright spot in the gloomy landscape. The dastardly outrage which robbed the Republic of its brilliant Finance Minister, Dr. Rašín (of whom a short biography will be found on page 636), was unquestionably an isolated incident, and does not correspond with any organised terrorist or subversive movement in the country. Indeed, throughout the winter there has been a steady process of consolidation.

With the formation of the Švehla Cabinet on 6 October, 1922, a transition period in Czech politics was brought to a close. From the autumn of 1920 the Government had been in the hands of a Cabinet of high permanent officials, and its character did not really change when, a year later, Dr. Beneš—who has been Foreign Minister since the achievement of independence—assumed the Premiership in addition to his other duties. This was avowedly a temporary step, involving, as it did, a preposterous amount of overwork; and friends of Dr. Beneš were distinctly relieved when he was again able to concentrate upon the Foreign Office and so diminish the strain upon him—though it must be added that he is still continually called in as arbiter for the settlement of all kinds of internal problems from which he should properly be dispensed. As it was, he remained Premier considerably longer than had been originally contemplated, owing to the prolonged ill-health of his proposed successor. Mr. Švehla's appointment represented a return to government on strictly party, as opposed to parliamentary, lines. As, quite apart from the attitude of the German minority, no single Czech or Slovak party can command anything approaching a majority, a coalition between the five principal groups was inevitable.

The five parties whose leaders had formed the famous "Pětka" of the revolutionary period, now once more divided the various portfolios between them—the Republican or Agrarian Party obtaining the Premiership and the ministries of the Interior (Malypetr), National Defence (Udržal) and Agriculture (Hodža); the Social Democrats also four posts—Education (Bechyně), Public Works (Srba), Social Welfare (Habrman) and Unification (Markovič); the National Socialists three—Railways (Stříbrný), Posts (Tučný) and Food (Franke); while the National Democrats and the Catholic People's Party obtained two each—the former, Finance (Rašín) and Commerce (Novák), the latter Justice (Dolanský) and Health (Monsignor Šrámek). The special Ministry for Slovakia was assigned to Dr. Kállay, a well-known Slovak lawyer and administrative official, standing outside the parties. This distribution reflects fairly accurately the balance of party influence in the country, where the Extreme Left has on the whole lost ground since 1920 and the Social Democrats have held

their own against the Communists, except in certain industrial centres such as Kladno. It is to be noted that finance and commerce were left in the hands of the bourgeois party *par excellence*, while the Socialists asserted their claim to the control of education, the chief means of communication, and the country's food supply. The Agrarians naturally retained for themselves the portfolio of Agriculture, and gave it to the most promising of the Slovak leaders, Dr. Milan Hodža, who had been Minister of Unification in a former Cabinet and may be expected to watch especially over Slovak interests in the all-important questions of land reform and administrative devolution. The Premier himself is a brilliant speaker, but above all the most skilful parliamentarian and tactician whom the Republic possesses. He has no rivals in the arts of lobbying and reconciling conflicting interests, and his only handicap is the broken health which has come from persistent overwork, coupled with lack of exercise. He is in any case admirably fitted to continue the work of consolidation begun by his predecessors. The main achievements of the Beneš Cabinet—apart from his own brilliant conduct of foreign affairs—lay in the field of finance, commerce, housing, communications and social welfare: and similar problems now faced the new Government, complicated for the moment by the downward plunge of the mark and the trade crisis to which this gave rise in Bohemia. The foremost points in Mr. Švehla's programme are a further reorganisation of the administration (and especially the strengthening of the new semi-autonomous Župa in Slovakia), the speeding-up of land-reform, for which the Land Office now possesses a detailed plan of action, the introduction of Old Age and Disablement Insurance, and a definition of the relations between Church and State, which has been rendered more delicate, but at the same time more urgent, by the growing secessions from the Roman Church and the formation of the so-called "Czechoslovak National Church." Dr. Rašin, as Finance Minister, pledged the new Cabinet from the outset to strict economy and a reduction of taxation. He put forward the reassuring view, the disorder and instability of the German currency would tend to make Germany incapable of competition in foreign markets. At the same time he made it clear that Czechoslovakia's stubborn fight against inflation was now bearing solid fruit, not merely in confidence abroad, but in the general outlook of the population, and especially of the working classes, "who think more of what they can get for their money than of how much money they actually hold." A practical example of the solidity of Czech finance is the law drafted by Dr. Rašin, and carried into force after the attack upon his life, for the minting of Czechoslovak gold ducats. These new coins, which were modelled on those current under King George Poděbrad in the XVth century, are, of course, legal tender, but need not be accepted for payments; they are not to be quoted on the Bourse, until their value has become standardised.

Meanwhile Dr. Beneš maintained his high reputation in the sphere of foreign policy. In the previous winter he had successfully acted as mediator between London and Paris, starting from the assumption that it was a vital concern of the Little Entente to keep the two Western Powers together and to avoid at all costs the necessity of itself having to adhere to one side or the other. This motive inspired his activity at the Conference of Genoa, of which he had never approved and which indeed seemed to him doomed from the first to failure, but which he none the less valiantly strove to convert into at least a partial success, solely in the interests of Allied Unity. Indeed, so indispensable did he become as a confidential adviser to Western statesmen in their disputes, as to arouse considerable jealousy on the part of some of his colleagues in the Little Entente. This had an unfortunate result, when he withdrew Czechoslovakia's candidature as representative on the Council of the League of Nations, and allowed Yugoslavia to be put forward in his place. For the League, which had suffered from the extravagances of the Yugoslav delegates when the Albanian question was under discussion at the Assembly, now showed its disapproval by electing another neutral Power, Sweden. For the present, then, the Little Entente remains unrepresented, and Dr. Beneš's absence is generally regretted at Geneva.

In the Assembly, however, Czechoslovakia's position was actually strengthened by his wise handling of the Austrian, Hungarian and Minorities questions. He gave unreserved support to the scheme for setting Austria once more on her feet, emphasising the view that despite all she has a hopeful economic future, and reinforcing this conviction by contributing a credit of 500,000,000 Kč. At the same time he made it abundantly clear that neither Czechoslovakia nor the Little Entente as a whole had any designs against Italy or contemplated a mid-European Customs Union such as she might pardonably regard as a danger both to her political and economic interests. The old tendency of Prague to further a *détente* between Rome and Belgrade was thus once more manifested, and the Consulta was brought to realise very clearly the source of these false rumours. Since Geneva there has been a further improvement in this particular direction—on the one hand, owing to the moderation of Mr. Ninčić, the Yugoslav Foreign Minister (a moderation doubtless due in part to an obscure internal situation, but also to a genuine desire for good relations with Italy) and on the other hand, owing to the sane and realist Adriatic policy pursued by Signor Mussolini since his seizure of power.

When the rights of minorities under the various Peace Treaties came before the Geneva assembly, the influence of Dr. Beneš secured a reasonable compromise on the resolutions of Professor Gilbert Murray. The latter had proposed (*a*) the formation of a special international Court for questions concerning the nationalities, and even administrative matters, and (*b*) the League's right to send permanent delegates to the various states concerned, in order to control grievances on the

spot. This was opposed on three grounds—1. that the proposed procedure involved increasing obligations on the part of the States concerned, but no corresponding obligation on the part of the minorities; 2. that unrestrained concessions would certainly be misused by groups of agitators against the Treaties, and tend to undermine the idea of state-sovereignty, to create general confusion, and in the end to render the League obnoxious to the majorities; and 3. that while almost every state in Europe has its minorities, provisions for minority protection were only being enforced in a few specific cases, and thus two categories of states were being created. These objections were considered reasonable, and the resolutions were modified in the sense that equal emphasis was laid on respect for the rights of minorities and on the obligation of these latter towards the states and majorities with whom they were connected—in other words, on the duty of loyalty to the State.

As regards the admission of Hungary to the League of Nations, Czechoslovakia and her colleagues of the Little Entente did not oppose, but confined itself to emphasising the international obligations solemnly assumed by Hungary. The report submitted by the Supreme Military Council to a Sub-Committee of the League had already made it clear that the Hungarian Government's aims and method of applying the new military laws must be followed with the utmost reserve; that the volunteer character of the army was "dubious"; that secret preparations for mobilisation existed; that irregular formations played an important military rôle; that the Government placed every obstacle in the way of the Committee of Control; that the destruction of war material and general disarmament had only been partially carried out, and that therefore an Allied Board of Control was still needed in Hungary. On receipt of this report the Sub-Committee, while still recommending Hungary's admission, endorsed the view that the Treaty had only been very imperfectly fulfilled. The Czechoslovak delegate, Dr Osuský, while not opposing admission, drew the League's attention to various measures taken by the local authorities in various parts of Hungary during 1922 to enforce military service, in direct contradiction to the Treaty. Since that date abundant evidence has accumulated to show that Hungary has evaded her military obligations, and the activities of the "Awakening Magyars" and other terrorist organisations, which dominate both the Government and the Regent, require constant watching on the part of the Little Entente. The most recent proof of this is afforded by the trial of Magyar emissaries in Bucarest, in February 1923, for a projected bomb outrage upon the King and Queen of Roumania at the racecourse. Their connection with the Budapest General Staff and White terrorist "detachments" would appear to have been established, and the Yugoslav Foreign Minister, Mr. Ninčić, was fully justified in declaring that relations between Hungary and the Little Entente as a whole can hardly be expected to

improve, so long as such elements retain their power in the former country, and plot actively for the reintegration of the old pre-war Hungary and the restoration of the fallen Hapsburg dynasty.

[*The first news of the Yugoslav elections was only received as this number goes to press : and in view of the obscure political position which has resulted, it seems better to postpone the Yugoslav section of the Chronicle till No. 4.*]

D.—RUSSIAN BOLSHEVISM AND ISLAM.

Notes on Bolshevik Propaganda in Mohamedan Countries.

The Mission Scientifique du Maroc, which devotes itself to the study of movements in the whole Mohamedan world, has published recently two instructive volumes entitled *Le Bolchévisme et l'Islam*, dealing with the methods and results of propaganda among the Mohamedans of Western and Central Asia. The publication of a Soviet decree of 20 November, 1917, proclaiming for all peoples the right of self-determination, followed by a proclamation by Lenin to the Mohamedans of Russia and of the East exhorting them, Persians, Turks, Arabs and all others, to lend their support to the revolution in which Russia had taken the lead against the rapacity of capitalism and Imperialism, were the prelude to the formation of a Commissariat for Mohamedan affairs, with Mullah-Nuur-Vakhitov, a Tartar member for Kazan, in the old Constituent Assembly. A return to the Tsarist principle of centralisation soon took place, however, and culminated in the re-organisation of the Commissariat of Nationalities last July under Kalinin, when the chief institutions created for or re-adapted to Bolshevik propaganda were placed under its control.

The most typical of these institutions is "the Communist University of Workers in the East," founded in 1920 at Moscow under the direction of "Comrade" Broydo, formerly a S.R. lawyer in Turkestan. According to his report in the *Pravda* of 25 July last, there were already 700 students belonging to 57 different nationalities and speaking 57 different languages. Branches had been opened at Tashkend, Baku, and Irkutsk. That of Tashkend had over 300 students, and a special school for women with an attendance of about 50. Affiliated to the University there were special schools also for the Red army. Instruction was given on a strictly communist basis, and translations from the works of Lenin, Kautsky and Stalin as well as Karl Marx were made in Turkish, Arabic, Uzbek and Kirghiz, both for general distribution and for the use of the students. A "Scientific Association of Russian Orientalists," created under decree of 12 December, 1921, forms in itself a section of the Commissariat of Nationalities. Its activities radiate from Moscow over a large part of Asia, and into its service have been impressed many well-known specialists, such as Tardov for Persia, the sinologist Ivanov and

Vilensky-Sibiryakov for China, Raskolnikov and Nikulin for Afghanistan, Lavarov and Astakhov for Turkey. It publishes a review, *Novy Vostok*, or New East, with Pavlovich (Weltmann) as editor, for whom the New East comprises "all oppressed peoples not only in Asia but in Africa and South America, from whose exploitation capitalistic society in Europe and the United States draws its strength."

The "Institute of Oriental Languages" in Moscow has shed the name Lazare and extended its sphere of activities, and it is now divided into two sections, one for the Far East and one for the Near East in Central Asia. The number of students had increased to 279 at the beginning of last year, and significant additions to the course of lectures were those on Imperialism and colonial policy in the East. Early in 1920 an Oriental section was added to the Military Academy at Moscow. There are 80 students, partly recruited from the Commissariat of Foreign Affairs and partly from the Military Academy itself. Among languages taught are Hindustani and Turkish, as well as Persian. Affiliated to it is a "Circle of Practical Studies of the East." In Petrograd the Russian Academy of Sciences has been vigorously Orientalised, and the services of distinguished Academicians have been requisitioned, *e.g.*, Oldenburg for Indian subjects, Shcherbatskoy specially for Indian philosophy, Krachkovsky for Arabic, Kokovtsev for Semitic studies, Barthold for Oriental history, etc. The "Institute of Living Oriental Languages" was organised at the end of 1920 for training specialists, engineers, diplomatists, doctors, agricultural experts, etc. Preparatory courses are open to representatives of the proletariat who have finished their studies in the "Workers' Faculties." There are about 75 students and the professors include, besides members of the Russian Academy of Sciences already mentioned, Smirnov for Turkish, Kotvich and Vladimirov for Mongolian, Samoylovich for Turkoman dialects, Freimann and Romaskevich for Persian. The explorer Grum Griymailo lectures on Central Asian subjects. A strong Oriental impulse has been given to several other scientific institutions, and notably to the Oriental College of Universal Literature, which has published a whole series of translations from Oriental works. At Tashkend the Orientalist Andreyev presides over a separate "Institute of Oriental Languages."

This educational propaganda has already resulted in the opening of large numbers of schools in the villages as well as in the towns, but their success seems to be still in many places problematical. The *Pravda* of 3 November last says that in the Soviet Republic of Tartars, which has its seat at Kazan, the Tartar language has been made obligatory in all the schools and the teaching staff is adequate, but that in the Soviet Republic of the Bashkirs there were only then 1,209 schools, against 2,500 formerly in the one Government of Ufa which forms only a part of that Republic. The *Kyzyl Bairak*, or Red Standard, the official organ in Uzbek of the Soviet Republic of

Turkestan, admits that when the Government ceased to subsidise the Soviet schools and tried to throw the cost of maintenance on the local populations, the village committees proved recalcitrant, and, where they yielded to pressure, the children ceased to attend.

Among other interesting by-products of Bolshevik propaganda may be mentioned the social and political emancipation of Mohamedan women in the Soviet Republics of Azarbaiyan and Turkestan, as well as in Kazan, Caucasus and Crimea. A Congress of Transcaucasian women was held at Baku at the end of May, 1922, with a large attendance of Mohamedan women, and resolutions were passed for the abolition of polygamy and the prohibition of child marriages. There has been also a remarkable revival of dramatic art, and the *Izvestia* of 23 June last announced the arrival in Moscow of the director of the State Theatre of the Soviet Republic of the Bashkirs, "Comrade" Murtazian, who originally started his theatrical propaganda at Kazan. The Press has naturally received special attention and in Tashkend alone there is, besides the *Kyzyl Bairak*, another Bolshevik organ in Uzbek, the *Inkilab*, or Revolution, and the *Krasny Vostok*, or Red East, of which the Russian edition has, according to the *Izvestia*, a circulation of some 25,000 and the Tartar, Kirghiz and Uzbek editions between 12 and 13 thousand. In Persia, Turkey and Afghanistan there are also a considerable number of Red newspapers, more or less directly under Bolshevik control. Another interesting illustration of the influence of Bolshevik propaganda in Mohamedan Asia was provided at the great Mohamedan-Bolshevik Congress of "the Oriental Peoples" held at Baku on 20 September under the presidency of the well-known Bolshevik, Comrade Zinoviev, at which Enver figured prominently among the Turkish spokesmen, and affirmed his conviction that, "by setting in motion all the many revolutionary agencies in the East, they would succeed in breaking the teeth of the savage monsters of the West." It was at that Congress that the deposition of the Ottoman Sultan, which Mustapha Kemal carried out last December, was first mooted and advocated on the ground that the maintenance of a theocratic autocracy was incompatible with Bolshevik principles of freedom.

VALENTINE CHIROL.

ECONOMIC NOTES.

A.—RUSSIA.

NOTES ON RUSSIAN INDUSTRY.

It is a well-known fact that Russian industries are in a state of complete destruction. But many people have attributed this to the civil war, blockade, foreign intervention, and other causes—to any cause except the Communist rule. But in 1922 civil war has long since come to an end, the blockade is withdrawn, and the Soviet Government has even been recognised either *de jure* or *de facto* in Western Europe. And now, after the proclamation of the new economic policy and the syndicalising of Russian industry, the Soviet Government is yet compelled to contract all the branches of industry. This scheme of reducing industries was prepared as early as last spring, and the necessary measures were then taken. The engineer A. Yakub (*Ekon. Zhizn.*, 8.6.22) states that the reduction must in general include about 15 per cent. of the present industries. The various branches of industry have been reduced in the following percentages:—coal industry, 15 per cent.; ores, 33 per cent.; gold and platinum, 12 per cent.; salt, 33 per cent.; metals, 6–7 per cent.; cotton, 20–25 per cent.; wool, 20 per cent.; silk, 10 per cent.; linen, 20 per cent.; leather, 15 per cent.; chemicals, approximately, 5 per cent.; silicate: glass, 64 per cent.; porcelain, 34 per cent. The causes of these drastic measures taken by the Central Government are chiefly to be found in the impoverishment of the peasant population and the general decrease of their purchasing power. Secondly, there is a persistently growing scarcity of money, and all the trusts, in order to obtain money, are even compelled to sell their food supplies. Under such conditions Russian industries are overproducing, and some Communists have proposed to export the surplus. It sounds quite paradoxical that Russia should have a surplus, but such is the fact. The peasant cannot afford to buy even the most needed articles and they are stored in the factories. The consequence of this wholesale stoppage of factories is an increase of unemployment. The following table gives figures of unemployed for Moscow, Petrograd and 33 other towns¹:—

1922	Moscow	Petrograd	33 Other Towns
January	17,200	9,500	41,700
February... ..	17,800	14,000	42,300
March	19,400	17,200	41,800
April	18,200	24,600	47,300
May	34,200	45,600	59,000
June	39,400	37,700	69,100
July	32,700	50,500	73,600
August	35,600	60,000	—
September	39,300	65,600	—
October	48,000	—	—
November	55,400	—	—

¹ *Ekon. Zhizn.*, 24.12.22.

It is obvious that unemployment is steadily increasing and at present must reach much higher figures. Remuneration, which formerly included food rations, now consists exclusively of paper money. If we count in pre-war roubles, the following remuneration of skilled workmen prevailed in Petrograd and Moscow during September, 1922¹ :—

Trade	Petrograd		Moscow	
	1913	1922	1913	1922
Chemists	28·83	25·14	23·10	18·50
Leatherworkers	32·33	20·61	26·20	20·17
Metal workers	43·00	16·00	34·00	19·66
Food supply	22·33	18·55	21·00	21·44
Printers	34·58	16·45	18·50	16·80
Textiles	—	—	18·30	11·90

This table shows that the standard wage of the most skilled workmen is much lower than before the war. The Soviet officials get even less than the workmen. The average monthly salary of a Soviet official during the period April–September, 1922, amounted only to 8·66 pre-war roubles.²

Output.—The output in 1922, as usual, has fallen to the minimum during summer and increased in the autumn, owing to the new yield of crops. But this improvement is only temporary and in the spring, when the corn is consumed, the output will again decrease. The principal branches of industry had the following output in thousands of puds (the figures are taken from *Ekon. Zhizn.*) :—

Industry	1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	July	August	September	October	November
Iron ore	2,668	2,927	973	1,949	978	845	766
Copper ore	—	338	No information			283	188
Manganese	800	733	95	366	437	362	373
Salt	6,885	5,214	5,197	7,929	8,589	5,190	2,655
Coal	187,673	134,692	31,700	24,400	29,560	38,014	48,329
Oil	69,559	72,235	23,200	23,300	23,404	25,375	25,779
<i>Yarn :</i>							
Linen	357	256	25	45	92	131	140
Cotton	924	639	122	169	295	383	375
Wool	205	152	32	49	63	72	72
<i>Metals :</i>							
Pig iron	2,489	2,421	647	533	924	987	1,205
Martin steel	4,839	3,688	432	496	1,283	1,836	2,322
Rolled iron	3,515	2,207	191	289	952	1,164	1,470

¹ *Ekon. Zhizn.*, 23.12.22.

² *Ekon. Zhizn.*, 24.12.22.

HOW TO USE SOVIET FIGURES : AGRICULTURE AND EXPORT.

The Soviet Government, in view of the Hague Conference, tried to persuade Western Europe that there was an exceptionally good yield of crops in Russia this year and a possibility of export of cereals. The Soviet statisticians appear to have been instructed to provide special figures for this purpose. The trouble is that various Departments could not agree and have given quite contradictory figures. Not less than four attempts to calculate the yield of crops of 1922 have been made public. The first was made by Popov, head of the Central Statistic Department; the second by the statistician V. Mikhailovsky; the third by the statistician N. Vishnevsky, and the fourth by the Statistical Section of the State Plan Department.¹ The results of these attempts are shown in the following table :—

	Area under crops in million desyatines	Average yield in puds per desyatine	Yield of crops in mill. puds	
			Total	Net (without seeds)
By Popov	50	60	2,853	2,378
By Mikhailovsky ...	53	62	3,200	2,700
By Vishnevsky ...	70	50	3,400	2,700

The requirements of the population were calculated in the following way : the average standards of yearly consumption for the rural population were taken at 17 puds per head and for the town population at 10 puds per head. For the rural population this makes a total of 1,631 million puds, and for the town population the total of 175 million puds. Thus, according to Popov, the grand total of requirements is 1,806 million puds. The final conclusion of these calculations of Popov is that this year Russia will have about 500 million puds of surplus for export.

These figures were calculated before the final results of the crops were known. Strangely enough, the Central Statistical Department has not yet published (February, 1923) the corrected results. It is obvious at first sight that all the above estimates are exaggerated, but as the Soviet Government is determined to export cereals at all costs, the only thing left is silence on the subject. Owing to departmental jealousies, however, the Commissariat of Agriculture has published its own figures as to the area sown in 1922. This area was actually only 41,383,000 desyatines (except potatoes, flax, hemp, etc.), and not 50 or 70 million desyatines as calculated before. The average yield per desyatine was also much lower than the figure of Popov and, according to local information, actually amounts to about 45 puds

¹ *Ekonomicheskaya Zhizn*, 17.8.22.

per desyatine. The total yield of crops amounted to about $41 \times 45 = 1,845$ million puds, or about 1,000 million puds less than is calculated by Popov. The requirements of the population of Russia greatly exceed his figures. Thus the average yearly consumption of the Russian population for the period of 1900-1903 for the same territory (see *Russian Economist*, No. 4) amounted to 2,167 million puds. But let us assume, with Popov, that requirements vary according to crops, and let us accept his low standards as real. Even in this case we arrive at the following figures: Total yield, 1,845 million puds, net yield (without seeds) 1,450 million puds, and the requirements of the population, according to Popov, are 1,806 million puds. Instead of a surplus of 571 million puds we get a deficit of 356 million puds. We understand why the Soviet Government, while it continues to export cereals, should not give these data. The population is very suspicious and is opposed to the exportation of cereals. Recently Russian papers published the information that, owing to the strike of railwaymen, seven trains, full of corn, destined for export, were detained on the road. The detachment of the Red Army sent to quell the strike, after learning that the freight was for export, declined to use compulsion with the railwaymen, and so the trains remained on the spot. As we see, the population clearly understands that every pud exported means a continuance of starvation. If we study the variations of areas sown during the last ten years, we shall see that just summer wheat and barley, which were the principal exports before the war, have most decreased in area. Professor N. Oganovsky gives the following table of areas sown in thousands of desyatines¹ :—

	1913	1916	1920	1921	1922	Percentage to area of 1913
Winter rye ...	22,902	20,485	16,304	15,484	16,409	71·6
Winter wheat	5,342	5,823	3,782	3,790	3,330	62·3
Summer rye	560	576	352	379	241	43·0
Summer wheat	20,782	17,180	13,479	10,137	5,549	26·7
Oats ...	15,137	14,810	10,342	8,899	6,711	44·3
Barley ...	9,565	8,875	5,940	5,534	2,916	30·5
Buckwheat	1,751	1,823	1,749	1,536	1,595	88·2
Millet ...	3,008	2,787	3,851	3,249	4,632	154·0
Total grains	79,047	72,359	55,799	49,008	41,383	52·3
Flax ...	1,250	1,331	647	655	643	51·4
Hemp ...	584	518	334	261	188	32·2
Sugar beet ...	697	613	180	185	162	23·2
Maize ...	827	895	874	913	2,102	254·2

This table shows that all grains and technical plants, which were cultivated chiefly for export, have lost an enormous part of their

¹ *Ekou. Zhizn.*, 1.6.23.

areas. On the other hand, grains cultivated for local consumption have lost very little, and in some cases (such as millet and maize) have even increased their areas. The conclusions to be drawn from these data are, firstly, that Russia cannot export cereals until the areas under summer wheat and barley reach their original figures; and, secondly, that the Soviet Government, if it exports foodstuffs, must condemn the population of Russia to starvation.

B.—POLAND.

Area under cultivation, 1921-22.

(In hectares, round figures.)

—	Congress Poland (1)	Pomerania (2) and Poznań (3)	Teschen and Silesia	Galicia (4)	Eastern (5) Districts
Rye - -	2,125,000	850,000	8,400	645,000	750,000
Potatoes -	1,000,000	400,000	6,100	525,000	346,000
Oats - -	1,100,000	210,000	9,000	680,000	346,000
Barley -	467,000	140,000	2,000	350,000	153,000
Wheat -	402,000	92,000	3,000	430,000	101,000
Sugar beet -	26,590	52,000	—	1,800	1,000

(1) In the Kielce district, the soil is only fair; in the Lublin and San-domierz districts, very rich. (2) There is rich alluvial soil near the mouth of the Vistula. (3) All gradations of soil from very rich to very poor. (4) In Podolia, very rich soil, of the Ukrainian "black-earth" type; in the Carpathian foothills, poor soil. (5) The season 1921-2 has been the first real season in these districts since the Bolshevik invasion.

C.—CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

GROWTH OF POPULATION IN BOHEMIA-MORAVIA-SILESIA.¹

(a) *During the last Ten Years.*

	Marriages	Births	Deaths	Increase (+) Decrease (-) of Population
1911 - - -	74,497	284,220	198,643	+77'810
1912 - - -	73,262	275,454	196,041	+71'924
1913 - - -	69,574	270,607	183,070	+79'822
1914 - - -	58,552	264,438	181,981	+75'284
1915 - - -	37,188	193,803	193,900	-5'243
1916 - - -	32,726	136,717	179,796	-46'978
1917 - - -	37,354	123,407	182,554	-62'616
1918 - - -	55,242	116,820	227,729	-114'240
1919 - - -	119,464	187,105	171,298	+10'577
1920 - - -	128,581	238,428	169,779	+61'974
Average 1911-20	68,644	209,100	188,479	+14'831

(1) From Zprávy (Reports) of Czechoslovak Statistical Office, No. 29, pp. 227-8. The figures for Slovakia are not yet available.

(b) *In 1920.*

	Marriages	Births	Deaths	Ditto per 1,000 of the Population		
1. Bohemia - - -	90,653	158,567	116,440	13·6	23·8	17·5
2. Prague (included in 1.)	12,421	12,484	11,958	18·4	18·4	17·7
3. Moravia & Silesia	42,863	90,958	60,011	12·8	27·3	18·0

D.—JUGOSLAVIA.

I. POPULATION AND AREA.

Provinces.	Area (in sq. km.).	Population.
N. Serbia (<i>i.e.</i> , Serbia of 1912) - - -	49,950	2,656,078
S. Serbia (<i>i.e.</i> , territory acquired in 1912-13)	44,768	1,524,601
Croatia-Slavonia - - -	42,534	2,591,860
Montenegro - - -	9,668	192,010
Voivodina—Banat - - -	9,776	582,552
Bačka and Baranja - - -	9,926	797,873
Bosnia-Herzegovina - - -	51,199	1,876,543
Dalmatia - - -	12,729	329,070
Krk (Veglia) and Medjumurje - - -	2,169	117,864
Slovenia and Prekomurje - - -	16,243	1,056,464
Total - - -	248,962	11,724,915

2. PRINCIPAL TOWNS.

Belgrade - - -	111,740	Sombor - - -	31,332
Zagreb (Agram) - - -	108,338	Zenta - - -	30,697
Subotica (Szabadka) - - -	101,857	Maribor (Marburg) - - -	30,641
Sarajevo - - -	60,087	Bitolj (Monastir)- - -	30,641
Ljubljana (Laibach) - - -	53,306	Veliki Bečkerek (Nagy Becskekerek)	27,523
Skoplje (Ūsküb) - - -	41,066	Vršac (Versecz) - - -	26,975
Novi Sad (Neusatz, Ujvidék) 39,147		Velika Kikinda - - -	25,810
Osijek (Essek) - - -	34,412	Niš - - -	25,096
Split (Spalato) - - -	31,542		

E.—BULGARIA.

EXPORT OF TOBACCO FROM BULGARIA (1921).

(Kindly supplied by the Department of Overseas Trade.)

To	In kilos.	In levas.	To	In kilos.	In levas.
Austria -	779,337	22,938,504	U.S.A. -	52,756	3,344,460
Britain -	96,636	3,377,635	Turkey -	16	1,350
Belgium -	164,167	4,332,357	France -	60,172	1,613,715
Germany -	5,857,716	166,431,215	Holland -	1,022,925	21,980,185
Greece -	74,472	4,426,193	Czechoslovakia	2,638,157	72,260,463
Egypt -	368,012	9,840,368	Switzerland -	72,422	2,299,455
Spain -	7	280	Sweden -	18,873	804,940
Italy -	6,286,617	199,763,117	Jugoslavia -	1,405,958	39,060,305
Poland -	529,945	14,259,791			
Roumania	26,459	1,853,722	Total -	19,454,647	568,588,055

During 1922, 319,034 decares have been planted with tobacco, as compared with 218,742 decares in 1921.

IMPORT OF COPPER SULPHATE TO BULGARIA (in kgm.).

	1918	1919	1920	1921	1922 (Jan.-Feb.)
From					
Austria-Hungary	449,690	—	—	—	—
U.K. - - -	—	350,690	252,604	844,822	263,838
Germany - -	579,014	—	—	81	11,433
Italy - - -	—	286,708	3	10	12,175
Russia - - -	112,784	—	—	—	—
Turkey - - -	—	42,973	870	6,668	—
France - - -	—	—	—	249,054	10,964
Other countries -	5	—	100	595	1,868

REVIEWS.

PESSIMISM "IN EXCELSIS."

Europa-Rosja-Azja. Szkice polityczno-literackie (Europe, Russia, and Asia: Political and Literary Sketches). By Prof. M. Zdziechowski. Wilno, 1923. Pp. 336.

ANOTHER modern Apocalypse!

There has been no lack of predictions of coming evil to our civilisation during the four years of the troubled and unhappy state called Peace which have now followed the four years of war. In Germany, Oswald Spengler, in a grandiose work, prophesies "the ruin of the Occident" (*Der Untergang des Abendlandes*); in France, G. Batault has been inspired by the works of Marshal Foch to write a book under the eloquent title *La Guerre Absolue*. In Poland a physicist, R. Świątochowski, even had the extraordinary idea of interpreting the coming universal equality of Socialism as a social analogy to the physical end of the world, on Clausius's theory of the transformation of all energy into warmth and the equal distribution of that warmth throughout the universe. A Polish philosopher, Florian Znaniecki, has spoken of the "Fall of Western Civilisation," with considerable insight and profound emotion, in a recent book. All these, and some other rhapsodies of modern Cassandras, are passed in review by Professor Zdziechowski in his concluding chapter, significantly entitled "The End of Europe."

What is his own personal contribution to the philosophy of contemporary history? He summed up the results of many years of research in his favourite field—religious currents in XIXth century literature—in a work in two volumes, published on the very eve of the war, and therefore not duly noticed. He called it—significantly again—"Pessimism, Romanticism, and the Foundations of Christianity." The book was chiefly noticeable for the prominence it gave to Schopenhauer as an epoch-making factor in XIXth century thought. Again and again the author expressed it as his profound conviction that only a full realisation of the fact that "the heart of the sons of men is full of evil" (*Eccl.* 9, 3) can produce a real religion. Like Cardinal Newman, whom he admires, he considers the doctrine of original sin as an appropriate symbol for a truly philosophical view of the world.

In the new book, which in its outward form is simply a collection of his war-time and post-war essays and addresses, the author has dotted the *i*'s of his pre-war philosophy. Repeatedly in it he declares himself to be a confirmed pessimist, and he elaborates his philosophical theory of evil into the proposition that only a full sense of the utter

irrationality of the world-process can be the foundation for a religion and the stimulus for Man's endeavour to fight evil.

Now the present reviewer happens to be an optimist by nature. This difference, being one of temperament, cannot usefully be argued about. But he differs from Professor Zdziechowski yet further in thinking that only a belief in the essential *rationality* of this world can encourage Man to any active exertion, and that every kind of God which Man believes in, is and must be (however inadequate and anthropomorphic) a *rationale* of the Universe.

But the book deals more with current political problems than with first principles. The reviewer regrets to say that here again, he differs from the author on most of the vital points of his argument. It is perhaps fair to begin with the one on which he most fully agrees and sympathises with him. In a chapter from his diary of 1917, called *The Legions and the Polish Cause*, Zdziechowski gives a profoundly affecting account of the tragic dilemma which all Poles lived through when Poland's two greatest historical enemies—Germany and Russia—went to war. But it was surely political quixotism to attempt, as Professor Zdziechowski then did in Petrograd and Moscow (partly in the presence of his present reviewer), to explain and defend before Russian audiences the attitude of those Poles—Piłsudski and his legionaries—who solved the problem for themselves by taking arms on the side of Austria.

The same quixotism of a noble idealist prevails throughout in Professor Zdziechowski's truly startling treatment of certain important post-war issues. The relation to Germany may be taken first. As a graduate of a German university, I can only sympathise most warmly with the author's desire to see the best German tradition—the ideas and ideals of a hundred years ago—revived in German culture and public life. Professor Zdziechowski's German sympathies centre round his personal friend, the noble F. W. Foerster, well known before the war as a zealous propagandist of Christian principles in educational theory. Since the war, he has turned from individual to civic education, and in his endeavour to re-awaken the better soul of Germany, he has unearthed a forgotten thinker, Constantine Frantz, who, in the very period of Bismarck, made a last chivalrous stand on behalf of old German philosophical idealism against new German imperialism, and incidentally expressed sympathy with Polish aspirations. Professor Zdziechowski follows Foerster into these fields. But I cannot, unfortunately, share the hope he cherishes (or at least, cherished before the Rapallo Agreement of 1922) that the highly desirable intellectual *rapprochement* with the best elements of Germany can possibly, in any near future, culminate in a political understanding between the nations most immediately affected by the Bolshevik danger—principally Poland, Germany, and Hungary—towards a common defence of the values of civilisation against the Soviet foe.

And what can be said when we see the naïve credulity of an idealist scholar carried so far as to perceive a moving strain of patriotic honesty and an idealistic conception of Imperialism in the Memoirs of Admiral von Tirpitz, which, like so many other recent German Memoirs, are simply an attempt to shift a responsibility consciously and proudly borne in times of prosperity, on to the shoulders of others in a period of misfortune? The present writer has himself been deeply moved by reading in the published "Siberian Diary" of his fellow-prisoner Dr. Breitner (of Vienna) of the personal tragedy which the catastrophe of the Central Powers meant to a German patriot: but this was a sufferer of the rank and file, and not one of the great actors who themselves had shaped events.

From Germany we may pass on to pre-war Austria. Professor Zdziechowski fondly remembers the complete self-government which Poles enjoyed there, and treats the person of the dead Emperor Francis Joseph with chivalrous reverence and gratitude for it. Now the reviewer, although himself brought up in an atmosphere of idolatrous personal worship of the aged Monarch, cannot at present see in his behaviour to the Polish nation more than a wise political opportunism forced upon Austria by her crushing defeats before and in 1866. And he cannot forget how this same Court of Vienna petted Ukrainian nationalism in Eastern Galicia, not out of any sympathy with national aspirations, which would have been generous enough, but on the principle of *divide et impera*, as applied to the growing power of the Polish element in the Dual Monarchy.

These things, however, are ancient history now. The part of the Dual Monarchy which has survived—Hungary—presents a more actual problem. Professor Zdziechowski was known even before the war for his Hungarian sympathies.¹ They are easily understood when we remember some historical facts: Poland and Hungary, both isolated in this respect among their mediæval neighbours, developed Parliamentary constitutions based on a "gentry democracy," in the later ages of feudalism; both were military outposts of Christian Europe against Islam and waged age-long wars against it; finally, there was hardly any friction between them in the course of their historical relations since the time of King Louis the Great of Poland and Hungary (in 1374), owing to the beneficent dividing range of the Carpathian mountains. In 1849, the Polish General Bem led the Hungarian insurrectionists against Austria and her Russian allies, and Hungary's greatest poet, Petöfi, was his *aide-de-camp*. All this has found due expression in national feeling, and the writer of this review has himself felt the stirrings of temperamental sympathy with chivalrous and cultured Hungarian officers who were his fellow-prisoners in Bolshevik Russia. But for all that, active sympathies with Hungary do not come within the range of practical politics for

¹ He gave expression to them after the war in his French pamphlet *La Tragédie de la Hongrie et la Question polonaise* (1921).

Poland, and there is a moral reason for this, too. Hungary has been savagely enough treated after the Peace of Versailles; some of this injustice has now happily been redressed by her admission to the League of Nations. But whatever injustice there may have been, was surely only a historical Nemesis for the equally savage and entirely Prussian treatment of Slavonic nationalities within the borders of the Hungarian kingdom before the war.

In his opinions concerning the Western Allies, Professor Zdziechowski is reserved enough, as far as France is concerned; but he is very outspoken as concerns British Imperialism. There is, in his view, very little to choose between that and German Imperialism before the war. The present writer, having devoted his life to promote the better knowledge of English civilisation in Poland, must, of course, disagree most emphatically on this point. Without entering into details, for which a "Slavonic Review" is not the place, one general line of argument may safely be taken. Professor Zdziechowski, at different times, wrote very ably both on Polish and on Russian "Messianism"—that is to say, on the romantic conception prevalent at one time among each of these nations that it was the "chosen nation of the Lord" in modern history.¹ He ought, therefore, to be better qualified than anybody else to appreciate the moral force and dignity which is imparted to the efforts of British Colonial administrators by the (latent and inarticulate) conception that they are the chosen instrument of Providence in bearing the "White Man's Burden" among their fellow men of different colour in various quarters of the globe.

This has brought us to the crucial test of any Pole's political philosophy—his attitude towards that nation which, in one way or another, has considered itself all along as the "Chosen People" of this contemporary world—the Russians. Professor Zdziechowski has a well-deserved reputation of being the Pole who is most intimately acquainted with modern Russian intellectual life; his lifelong friendships with such great Russian thinkers as Vladimir Solovyev and Eugene Trubetskoy, and such writings of his as his German book *Die Grundprobleme Russlands* (1907), give sufficient warrant for that.

His view of what has happened, and is happening in Russia, is naturally determined to a large extent by his profound sympathy with his friends among Russian intellectuals, who are now leading a homeless life of exile abroad. In the eyes of the present writer (who spent all the critical seven years, 1915–21, in Russia), they are certainly quite as worthy of human sympathy as were the Polish emigrants in Paris after the national catastrophe of 1831. Unfortunately, their political efforts amidst an apathetic Western Europe are quite as discordant, and above all, as weirdly unreal, as were the countless memoranda showered by those Poles upon the Foreign Offices and

¹ Cf. his Polish writings: *Messianists and Slavophiles* (1888), *The Rock of Messianism* (1912), *The Vision of Krasiński* (1912).

Parliaments of the West. Their fruitless interventionist propaganda has tainted Professor Zdziechowski's argument with some of its unreality; and so have their ceaseless denunciations of Bolshevism, which have, by overemphasis, done the anti-Bolshevist cause more harm than good. The author repeats, with approval, the declaration of a recent refugee from Russia (Zenaïda Hippus, the wife of Demetrius Merezhkovsky) that, in answer to the frequent inquiries in Europe as to civilised institutions in Soviet Russia, it can only be said that nothing of the sort exists. Of course, this is a misrepresentation of the truth. There is hardly any large town in Russia which has not now got a "Popular University" with some ten Faculties, or a "Polytechnic High School"; hardly any village which has not got a "Proletarian Culture" circle and a "People's Theatre." The trouble is not that nothing exists where there was something before; on the contrary, something exists very often where there was nothing before (as in the Siberian forest village of Tayshet, midway between Krasnoyarsk and Irkutsk, where I lived in 1920, to see even Dalcroze's rhythmical gymnastics taught!): the real complaint is that what exists, or has been called into existence, is barbarously mismanaged, vilely misused, or inefficient to the lengths of caricature, and unfitted to real needs.

One part of the great problem of what is to be done with Soviet Russia is the question—now purely academic—what Poland should have done with Soviet Russia after the war of 1920. Professor Zdziechowski, who is a native of the district of Minsk, where his paternal estate lies, has a ready answer to this question: he joins with that saintly figure, Bishop Łozinski, in denouncing the Peace of Riga between Poland and the Soviets as a political crime. Poland ought not to have stopped half way, but to have earned the gratitude of Russian patriots themselves by rescuing the whole of the old Poland's White Russian and Ukrainian provinces from Soviet tyranny. It is easy enough to say so for one who does not himself bear the burden of active political responsibility: but one must consider how much this would have added to the difficulties which the new Poland already has to meet in her endeavours to reconcile, in districts of mixed population, the sovereignty of a Polish State with the claims of non-Polish nationalities for a large measure of self-government. Besides, the incorporation of the whole of these territories would surely have added to the population of Poland a considerable number of actual Bolsheviks.

But, in the author's view, there is already a slipshod sort of semi-Bolshevism in the constitution of Poland as it is: the Land Reform Bill dictated by the peasants, the demoralising bureaucratism, the waning prestige of the educated class. Professor Zdziechowski has written very convincingly on the pernicious influence of Russian radicalism and the *doctrinaire* spirit on what

he calls the "possibilism" of Polish national mentality.¹ But, surely, his own early academic training in St. Petersburg has left a trace behind in his utter inability to value properly that arch-instrument of the art of politics—*compromise*. If he had himself been in the position of one of the rulers of the new Poland, or at least a member of the Constitutional Assembly, he would perhaps have realised how completely impossible it was for Poland to have any but the most radically democratic constitution and legislation—whatever were the dangers of demoralising effect or prematureness—just because the neighbourhood of a Communist Russia forbade any risk of provoking discontent among the masses.

Maxim Gorky warned Europe that if she did not enter into relations with Soviet Russia, she would drive that country into the embrace of Asia. The Russo-Kemalist alliance and the baneful Soviet propaganda among Asiatic nations, have since made the truth of his words manifest. On the other hand, the reaction against the passiveness of Europe in view of Soviet horrors has produced a different strain of Asiatic sympathies in the minds of Russian emigrants. A new school of philosophic and political thought has arisen in Belgrade and elsewhere, which is now known by the name of *Eurasianism*, and is inspired by the leading idea that Russia's national character and her possible contribution to future world-civilisation cannot, in the average and conventional sense, conform to European standards, but must be, like Russia herself, something midway between Europe and Asia. Professor Zdzichowski devotes a sympathetic chapter to this movement; in London, recently, a prominent member of the anti-Bolshevik Russian colony publicly professed his allegiance to ideas of this sort, at the year's inaugural meeting of the King's College Russia Society. No thoughtful student of the Russian mind can fail to be struck by the correctness of the underlying perception: to single out one instance only—who would deny that Tolstoy's morality is as near, to say the least, to Indian philosophy as to the teachings of the New Testament? But it must be admitted that "Eurasianism," being so far only a call to introspection, addressed to the Russian nation, and shrinking anxiously from all idea of actual political flirtation with the nations of Asia, is not as yet a developed programme of action, and hardly warrants the author's hope that an "Eurasian" Russia will be ready to grant to Poland, without dispute, her present Eastern frontier.

Professor Zdzichowski's reflections on the present state of Europe culminate in a prediction of ruin for Western civilisation; and the Yellow Peril is to be the instrument of this ruin. In the course of a quarter of a century, the threat of the "Yellow Peril" has been too often repeated (and by such prophets as William II., too!), not to lose all its terror in the eyes of the average European by sheer force

¹ In his Polish book on *Russian Influences upon the Polish Soul* (1920).

of habit. The recent withdrawal of the Japanese from Siberia has certainly lessened the force of this idea still further, and only those, who have seen what Chinese soldiers of the Red Army are capable of, may be expected to retain a vivid sense of the imminence of "the Yellow Peril." But even the present reviewer, who spent a year in the extreme east of Siberia under Japanese occupation, must freely confess to the belief that—how shall we put it mildly?—serious modifications of European civilisation under the coming *American* hegemony are a much more immediate contingency than the "Yellow Peril." The possible evolutions under American influence play their part in Professor Zdziechowski's vision, too: they come under the larger heading of "monstrosities of modern capitalism," as prophetically visualised before the war by that most witty and far-sighted Austro-Polish political philosopher, W. Dzieruszycki—now displayed in the shameless profiteering enormities of post-war Europe, and re-born even in a Socialist Republic under the "new economic policy." But they recede into the background before the Yellow Monster, which has evidently fascinated the author's imagination.

By this time, the reader has, no doubt, entirely lost patience with the reviewer. Since the latter, he will say, does not agree with the author either on first principles or on any question of practical politics, why should he single out the book for such elaborate notice at all? The answer is, that if I am young enough not to accept the author's notion that doomsday is near for all of us, I am, on the other hand, old enough to believe with him that this post-war European world we live in is a moral pandemonium. And an appeal to conscience is most desirable, even if it does not come on the very eve of doomsday. It is on account of its high and noble *moral* inspiration that I think Professor Zdziechowski's book worthy of the notice of every civilised European. If more books of this type are written in different languages, the moral force which they breathe may permeate public opinion, and in due time find its way into actual politics. Professor Zdziechowski finds it compatible with "Romantic Pessimism" to hold Man capable of success in a determined struggle against recognised evil. I shall therefore end in his own spirit if—German-bred as I am—I express my own moral hopes for humanity in a stanza of Schiller's, which has often fired me with enthusiasm:

Es ist kein leerer, schmeichelnder Wahn,
Erzeugt im Gehirne des Toren;
Im Herzen kündet es laut sich an:
Zu was Besserem sind wir geboren!
Und was die innere Stimme spricht,
Das täuscht die hoffende Seele nicht.

R. DYBOSKI.

London, Christmas, 1922.

Kronprinz Rudolf: Politische Briefe an einen Freund (1882-1889).
Eingeleitet von Dr. Julius Szeps. Vienna-Munich (Rikola Verlag).
1922.

THERE has recently appeared in Vienna a small volume which throws a flood of interesting light on the character of Crown Prince Rudolf, whose very real political promise was to a large extent eclipsed by the mystery and scandal which surrounded his untimely death in 1889. It was, of course, known that Rudolf had very definite Liberal ideas, differing fundamentally from those of his Viennese *milieu*; but it will probably be a surprise even to many of the initiated to find that for the seven years before his death he was in constant correspondence with one of the leading Jewish journalists of Vienna, Herr Moriz Szeps, the founder of the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*—expressing himself with the utmost freedom on the home and foreign politics of the day, and even on occasion supplying him with advance news of a confidential kind, by writing (of course strictly anonymous) *feuilletons* for the journal. No less than 174 letters are here published, and, though no clue whatever is given as to the principle followed in the fairly numerous “cuts,” there is certainly enough sensational matter left.

The frequency with which he insists upon extreme caution and upon the espionage around him, is not unnatural in view of the sentiments expressed. His disgust at the Taaffe *régime* is frequently reiterated; and in February, 1883, he passes the following verdict upon Austria:—“We live in an evil time—swindles, theft, high-placed ruffians, brutal and arbitrary methods, corruption, decay of the State. That is my view of present conditions. I am merely curious as an observer, as to how long a building, so old and tough as this Austria, needs to crack at every point and crumble together.” In December he writes, “May we awake out of the night of reaction”; and in January, 1884, he drops the phrase: “Police rule! the Fifties are back again.” Still more interesting is his verdict upon Hungary, not only because he has often been represented as devoted to the Magyar cause, but also because he quite genuinely saw in Magyar liberalism, with all its shortcomings, a certain check upon extreme reaction in Vienna. Writing in August, 1883, with reference to disturbances in Croatia and the growing menace of the “Slav Question,” he says:—“Hungary is badly administered, has not a good official class, no solid basis; it is a country like Russia or Turkey; just like these Empires, it lacks a rich educated middle class: it only has an official class, of which part is badly out at elbows (*arg verlottert*), many Israelites and poor people, impoverished peasants and a lot of riffraff; the real basis of a modern State, the *grande bourgeoisie*, is lacking. With Croatia such a country will not be able to conduct a successful struggle and put order into the internal situation. Hungary will move towards complete decay as a State, and the moment will come when Vienna will find it necessary to intervene.”

Six months later he tells Szepts how he had invited King Milan to a *tête-à-tête* dinner, "gave him a lot of sparkling Burgundy; *in vino veritas!* and he became talkative," betraying a "real gallows humour," and speaking of "the certain ruin of his Kingdom." On this occasion Milan appears to have declared that his only choice lay between "throwing himself into the arms of Russian Panslav policy, or remaining a good Austrian (*gut oesterreichisch*) and taking up the struggle against his own people; but for the latter he would need a concentration of Austrian troops on his frontier." These views, at which, the Crown Prince writes, both Foreign Office and War Office in Vienna were "quite horrified," strikingly confirm the charge so often made against King Milan, of having been little better than an Austrian agent.

Most interesting of all is the steady current of admiration for France and extreme distrust of Prussia which runs through the entire correspondence. In June, 1882, Rudolf stood sponsor to the future Crown Prince William of Prussia, and actually writes from Berlin, describing "the mutual attentions of the Courts of Vienna and Berlin" as due to the recovery of France, "who, hardly twelve years after Sedan, stands as an undeniable proof that Republics can do great things in Europe." "Prussia," he writes in the following November, "is only tender when it needs someone." France is to him "the source of all liberal ideas and institutions on the Continent," whereas Germany is nothing but "an enormously enlarged Soldateska, a pure military state." In August, 1883, he suspects Germany of planning war against France, and adds: "This would be like the old fighting cocks." In April, 1885, he learns from a very good source that Berlin does not want war, but, he adds, "Germany rests only on her bayonets, consists of too many states and individual heads, and is not inspired by a progressive civilising directive; hence she is never so influential as France was in her good days." In October he again has the impression that Bismarck wants to attack France, but considers France much more dangerous than in 1870. In May, 1886 (from Berlin), he reiterates his belief in the nearness of war; in August he writes that Berlin "woos our friendship in a quite incredible manner." Bismarck regards a French war as inevitable, but speaks far more of a Russian war, and no longer favours an Austro-Russian partition of interests in the Balkans, but wishes to see Austria-Hungary as the dominant Power. Kálnoky he criticises more than once for his distrustful and arrogant habits, and on one occasion bursts out:—"A pity for the money which all Europe wastes on its diplomacy. God knows the harm is greater than the advantage" (26 July, 1882). In May, 1885, he writes of Szögyény (in 1914 Austro-Hungarian Ambassador in Berlin) as "the only clever and normal head at the Ballplatz, who thinks like sensible men and does not hide behind the nimbus of his dignity." This is, of course, another hit at Kálnoky, for whose overthrow he prays in October, 1885, because under him the Ballplatz has become a mere "shuttlecock" between Berlin and St. Petersburg.

Very striking is his verdict on William II. in the first year of his reign. "William is shaping (*macht sich*); he is soon likely to cause great confusion in old Europe; I, too, have this feeling; he is just the man for it, . . . energetic and self-willed . . . holding himself for the greatest genius—what more can one want? In the course of a few years he is likely to bring Hohenzollern Germany to the point which it deserves." (24 August, 1888.)

Rudolf was not merely a Liberal, but disliked modern nationalism. "The principle of nationality," he writes, "is based on the most ordinary animal principles, it is really the victory of fleshly sympathies and instincts over the intellectual and cultural advantages which the ideas of the equality of all nations, and cosmopolitanism, offer to mankind"—a piece of typical journalese dating from his half-baked youth. But he could see far, and more than once expressed the fear that "old Europe has outlived itself and is now moving towards destruction. A tremendous reaction must come, and social upheavals from which, after long illness, an entirely new Europe will arise to new life." But with all his pessimism he professed himself "true to the Fatherland, whose future mission is my article of faith, and true to my Liberal principles, which I regard as right, because they rest on higher culture (*Veredelung*) and progress in intellectual development." These and similar passages bring home to the reader the pathos of the ill-starred Rudolf's blighted career, and inevitably suggest a speculation as to how European policy would have developed had the two Imperial thrones of Berlin and Vienna been filled between 1888 and 1914 by Frederick III. and Rudolf I.

R. W. SETON-WATSON.

Magyariens Schuld, Ungarns Sühne. Von Oskar Jászi. Preface by Eduard Bernstein. Munich (Verlag für Kulturpolitik), 1923. Pp. 250.

For a number of years before the war, at a time when Magyar Chauvinism seemed to have reached its zenith, and when the complete Magyarisation of Hungary was still a possible goal of attainment, a small group of scholars and economists, through the medium of the Sociological Society (a fairly exact equivalent of our own Fabian Society), and of its monthly organ *Huszadik Század* (The XXth Century), conducted a courageous and very uphill fight on behalf of Universal Suffrage, freedom of association and assembly, Land Reform and other democratic principles in Hungary. At the same time it steadily advocated justice for the non-Magyar nationalities of Hungary, and the fullest possible linguistic and cultural liberty in local administration, education, etc. Dr. Oskar Jászi, who was, perhaps, the most active and best known member of this group, drew down upon himself especial obloquy by the publication in 1912 of a

volume entitled *The Development of National States and the Question of Nationalities* (A Nemzeti Allamok Kialakulása és a Nemzetiségi Kérdés). It was a real misfortune that this book, which was much the most serious modern contribution to the question as a whole, was only published in Magyar, and therefore remained inaccessible to the Western public (I have the most serious grounds for believing that during the war my own copy was the only one in France and Britain).¹

On the very eve of war, Dr. Jászi and his friends had founded the so-called Radical party, whose daily organ *Világ* acquired increasing prominence as a focus of pacifism. At the October Revolution of 1918 he entered the Károlyi Cabinet, in a last despairing effort to win the non-Magyars to a policy of genuine racial and linguistic equality. It was, of course, too late: for full unity with their free kinsmen beyond the frontiers was now within their grasp. Jászi's policy for the Peace Conference—a "Hungarian Switzerland" in a Danubian Confederation, free trade with the neighbouring states, and in every case a plebiscite—was brushed aside by the march of events; and he had already resigned office a good many weeks before the collapse of the Károlyi experiment.

Dr. Jászi's account of the two Hungarian Revolutions, the Radical of October 1918 and the Communist of March 1919, and the contrast which he draws between them and the White Reaction which has prevailed since August 1919, is much the most weighty, detailed and convincing that has yet appeared. It should certainly serve as a corrective to those propagandists who are trying to discredit the very genuine democratic programme and ideals of the October Revolution by hanging round its neck the dead dog of Magyar Bolshevism, as practised by Béla Kun and a tiny clique of fifth-rate adventurers. Dr. Jászi's verdict acquires additional authority from the memorandum (here printed almost *in extenso*) which he and others addressed to the Emperor Charles on the eve of the upheaval, and which ably sets out the imminent dangers that threatened State and dynasty, unless prompt and energetic reforms could be carried through. In his opinion, the well-meaning Charles was held back from action mainly by three persons—Prince Windischgrätz, a narrow and frivolous aristocrat, whose recently published memoirs are as unreliable as they are indiscreet and enlightening; Mr. Vázsonyi, the vain Jewish demagogue who had attached himself to the Legitimist cause; and Baron Sztérényi, the brilliant *arriviste* and *affairiste* who is typical of the less ornamental but most effective side of Hungarian pre-war politics. Dr. Jászi states very lucidly the theory of the two Revolu-

¹ I may, perhaps, be permitted to mention that not long after this book appeared, the foremost organ of Hungarian Chauvinism, the *Budapesti Hírlap* fiercely denounced Dr. Jászi as "Ephialtes" and "the Magyar Scotus Viator." This was, of course, intended as a most deadly insult, coming from such a quarter, but in view of its source I personally accepted it as a high compliment and am still very proud of it.

tions. "Revolution simply means that evolution has proved unequal to the task of reaching the necessary results by the normal method of argument and compromise; that the superstructure of commonsense collapses; and that the new equilibrium which must inevitably arise can only be produced by the clash of wild animal instincts and rival wills. . . . The Government of the October Revolution, then, was a last attempt at a reasonable adjustment of wildly excited social forces; but the spiritual and moral structure of Hungarian society was too weak to stave off catastrophic methods of social upheaval."

Dr. Jászi is very right to emphasise the falsity of the theory that it was the October Revolution and the Károlyi Government which destroyed the Austrian front, till then proud and unbroken. He states but the bare fact when he describes this as "a deliberate lie, invented to save the artificial Habsburg legend"—and, he might have added, to exalt the present Hungarian *régime* at the expense of its liberal rivals. Before ever the Károlyi Government came into power or its War Minister Colonel Linder gave the order for surrender, the whole Austro-Hungarian Army was riddled with disaffection, and entire regiments had thrown off all discipline and actually left the front. It was Dr. Wekerle, the Premier of the old *régime*, who ordered the surrender of Fiume to the Yugoslavs; it was no less a person than Admiral Horthy who handed over the fleet at Pola to the revolutionary Yugoslav Committee; and Linder, in recalling the Hungarian regiments, merely followed the precedent of the Zagreb National Council and the Prague revolutionary government. The plain fact is that it was the army itself, as it hurried homeward, that really made the Revolution and carried Károlyi into power. In the same way it was military anarchy quite as much as the attitude of the Entente which undermined the new *régime*. No possible effort on the part of Károlyi or anyone else could have prevented the dissolution of the old army, and there was no Republican Guard or similar organisation to take its place, with the result that the Government had literally no force behind it, and was at the mercy of subversive elements. Jászi appears to have advocated the formation of an armed peasant corps, to each member of which a free gift of 10 yokes of land would have been secured after two years of service. But not merely this scheme, but the scarcely less vital agrarian reform, was prevented by the doctrinaire attitude of the Socialist wing of the Government. Though it was obvious that a speedy land reform was the only sure means of breaking feudalism, strengthening the democratic and co-operative movement and increasing production, they preferred their barren propaganda for the "single tax" and other quack remedies, and nothing was done.

The task which confronted the men of the October Revolution was not merely far beyond their powers, but was a frankly impossible one, and it is but fair to remember that all the leaders, except the Socialist group, were only too conscious of the fact. But the ideas

for which they stood were essentially sound, and are still alive; and this it is that prompts the calumnies of their enemies. One of Jászi's most interesting chapters is his vindication of Károlyi, who is "far from being a mere political amateur and impressionist," though he is handicapped by "a certain dogmatic rigidity," and by his inability to judge, and therefore to select, the men around him. Károlyi, he argues, saw into the future when he advocated Kossuth's old idea of a Danubian Confederation (Hungary, Serbia, Roumania) against the Habsburgs; and certainly he of all men practised what he preached when he divided his vast estates among the peasantry. An aristocrat—so he sums him up—who "put all the fantasy, intuition, foolhardiness, all the chivalry and romanticism of the former sportsman and gambler into the service of democracy. . . . There is in him something akin to Dostoyevsky's Idiot, who was so-called because he took principles and characters in earnest with childlike simplicity." Or as Mr. Eugene Bagger puts it in his *Eminent Europeans* (New York, Putnam, 1922, p. 208), "Some of his friends, wishing to damn him with faint praise, called him the Pure Fool of Hungary. If he be that—the accent is on the pure."

Dr. Jászi's analysis of the Communist *régime* differs from the venomous tirades of Cecile Tormay in *An Outlaw's Diary* (London, Philip Allan, 1923) as light from darkness. "On the intellectual side, the dogmatic belief in an inevitable and catastrophic collapse of the existing world-order; on the moral side, the rejection of every moral check as a mere *bourgeois* prejudice; on the political side, an uncritical reliance on force, terror and organised compulsion—such is a synthesis of the ingredients that make up the Bolshevik soul" (p. 128). As he points out elsewhere (p. 145), "without a corresponding ethical discipline, every communist experiment remains merely sham communism, and no terror or force can alter this." Jászi estimates "the spiritual General Staff" of the Magyar Communist *régime* at 50, and the real camp of convinced adherents—*citoyens actifs*—at 5,000; and he tells us that one of the chief commissaries has criticised this estimate as much exaggerated! Unlike the "White" pamphleteers, he is careful to distinguish between the small group whose motive was the *idée homicide*, and whose victims (between 400 and 600) were about one-tenth of the victims of the White Terror, and the still smaller group of real idealists who lived for the twin gospels of Marx and Freud. But his criticism is infinitely more damaging, by reason of its moderation, especially when he describes the final stages of "bureaucratisation" and militarisation.

His survey of the Horthy *régime* should be read by every serious journalist in the West and by everyone who cares for the pacification of Europe. The "Christian Course" of Admiral Horthy aims at the *restitutio in integrum* of the old feudal and clerical *régime* in Hungary, which was one of the prime causes of the Great War: and Dr. Jászi has every right to contrast the "big" if reactionary figure of the late

Count Tisza with "the banditti and panamists," who dominate Hungary to-day. Resting on the double basis of *Revanche* and rancorous anti-Semitism, this *régime* by its very nature pours oil on the flames. Abroad it prevents the consolidation of Central Europe, by fostering irredentism in all the Succession States; while at home, under pretext of limiting the undue influence of the Jews, it merely serves to increase their parasitic character, abruptly checks that process of Jewish assimilation of which pre-war Hungary was so proud, and forces the Jews into the position of a new nationality, hardly less discontented than the old. The institution of a *numerus clausus* in the Universities is merely one feature of the "Hetz" against liberal intellectuals, of whom a high proportion are Jews. Many men of the highest standing have been deprived of academic posts, and thousands of Magyar Liberals are in exile at Vienna and elsewhere. The worst feature of the present *régime* is its dependence upon the "armed detachments" of Hejjás, Prónay, Gömbös and the "Awakening Magyars." The massacres of Siófok and Orgovány, the torture of the wine merchant Landau, the outrages upon Madame Hamburger, the murder of the Socialist leaders Somogyi, Bacsó and Cservenka, the wholesale internments and excesses, the daily corpses in the Danube, are but a small fraction of the truth; and men who have been publicly accused of complicity or have even boasted of their crimes, are sheltered by the "hidden forces" behind the Regent, and released from prison when a feeble attempt is made to bring them to justice. There is evidence which seems to connect them with such incidents as the bombing of the Radical Party's banquet last April, the attempt upon the King and Queen of Roumania, and the infernal machine sent to Mr. Rassay a month ago; yet no attempt has been made to set the law in operation. Yet Gömbös is still all-powerful with the Regent and with the Bethlen Government; he it was who made Charles's second "Putsch" a failure and who was given dictatorial powers at the elections of last year.

Just as a narrow franchise was the main bulwark of the pre-war oligarchy, so Horthy and his friends soon found that honest elections on a basis of universal suffrage would prove fatal to their *régime*. Failing to obtain the last Parliament's sanction for the change, they introduced in February 1922, by arbitrary decree, a new franchise which reduced the number of votes by a million (in a total population of barely 7,800,000), and replaced the ballot by public voting in all the country constituencies. Count Klebelsberg, the author of the measure, justified this last provision as necessary in order to check the passions of the masses. In ordinary parlance, this means that a "faked" majority had to be secured by intimidation, bribery, prohibition of meetings, arrest of candidates and other equally drastic methods. The "detachments" in particular organised in many places an armed terrorism against the opposition; and even in the towns the ballot was rendered partially nugatory by a provision requiring every candi-

date's nomination papers to be signed by not less than 10 per cent. of the electors. Deplorably little is known about these conditions in the West, and this is due not merely to persistent and unscrupulous propaganda abroad, but to an elaborate conspiracy of silence at home, based upon terrorist action, the muzzling of the press, and laws "for the more effective protection of the State and of Social Order."

Dr. Jászi's book throws light into one of the darkest spots in Europe to-day, and deserves to be known as widely as possible; for the establishment of a Liberal Hungary is a general European interest.

R. W. SETON-WATSON.

La Jugoslavia. By O. Randi. (Pubblicazioni dell' Istituto per l'Europa Orientale in Roma. Seconda Serie, vol. I.). Napoli (R. Ricciardi), 1922. pp. 582. 3 maps. 20 lire.

THOSE who desire to inform themselves regarding the development of the new states of Central and South-Eastern Europe are handicapped at every turn by the lack of any adequate literature on the subject. So far as Jugoslavia is concerned, this gap has been filled by Signor Randi, and those who know Italian will find in his book a veritable mine of information on almost every detail of politics, administration, trade, industry, finance, religion, education, etc. He is to be congratulated, both upon his industry, critical sense and general accuracy, and also on his patriotic achievement, since there is no European country where the Jugoslavs are so little known and so often misrepresented as in Italy, and where, therefore, there is so much need for an exhaustive and reliable presentation of the facts. It is true that in Italy several scholars of high repute—notably Signori Prezzolini, Salvemini and Maranelli—have made important contributions to the Adriatic question; but not merely is this a mere fragment of the Jugoslav problem as a whole, but the deliberate policy of the Consulta subjected them to censorship at the critical period of the war, and marred their effect by highly inferior propagandist literature, well calculated to cloud the issue and present the Jugoslavs in a false light. It is a sign of the times that such a work as that under review should come from the pen of an Italian and, if it receives the attention which it deserves from Italian public opinion, it should do a great deal to improve the relations between the two countries.

Geography has been unkind to the Jugoslavs. Dalmatia, their façade to Europe, is more accessible from the sea than from the land, and its wide hinterland has, throughout most of its history, been isolated from world-currents, though at critical moments all too exposed to the march of armies alike from East to West, using it as a corridor of advance. Thus, from the decay of the Roman Empire till 1918, there has never been a single powerful and independent

state, uniting all the regions to-day known as "Jugoslavia." For nearly thirteen centuries the Jugoslavs have been torn between the rival influences of Rome and Byzantium, and political developments in modern times have complicated still further a conflict which is spiritual even more than political, by adding the dual and mutually hostile influences of Vienna and Budapest. When at last a supreme European crisis brought to them the *Konjunktur* necessary for their achievement of unity, the nation, as a whole, was barely ready for so great a change. Thanks to unfavourable geographical conditions, lack of communications and education, and a deliberate policy of separation and division on the part of their rulers, large sections of the nation were still utterly parochial in outlook and living in water-tight compartments. Hence a considerable time must, of necessity, elapse before "Jugoslavia" can "find herself," and there is no need for pessimism or impatience if the new state, when faced by such gigantic problems of reorganisation and readjustment, has, even after four years, not succeeded in clarifying the political situation, or even reaching a constitutional settlement acceptable to the majority. It is not merely, or indeed not so much, the very definite distinction between Serb, Croat and Slovene that has to be overcome, but the barriers which a long historical process has established between at least eight different units—Serbia, Croatia-Slavonia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Slovene lands, Dalmatia, Montenegro, Macedonia and Southern Hungary. And yet these obstacles must not be exaggerated, as Signor Randi is perhaps a little inclined to do: for there are two very powerful guarantees of unity which he does not bring out with sufficient clearness. On the one hand literary unity is far more advanced than he seems to realise, and it is distinctly misleading to compare "Slovene to Piedmontese, Croat to Venetian, Serb to Tuscan, Dalmatian to Apulian, Macedonian to Sicilian." In reality, the differences of dialect in Jugoslavia are utterly trifling compared with those between the Italian (and, indeed, German, or even English) provinces. It is quite true that chaos still prevails in all technical and specialised subjects, that there are many quite useless synonyms (the three words for "theatre"—*pozorište*, *kazalište*, *gledalište*—are a good example), that an uniform terminology is badly needed, and that the divergence between Slovene and Serbo-Croat presents a very real difficulty. But none the less the parallel labours of men like Vuk Karadžić, Gaj and Daničić during the "Illyrian" period and later, gave linguistic and literary development a directive both in Serbia and Croatia, which more than justifies Professor Jagić in claiming literary unity as the forerunner of political union (see p. 523 of this REVIEW). On the other hand there is a solid guarantee in the fact—too little realised and only cursorily mentioned by Signor Randi (p. 46)—that "Serb" and "Croat" are not in the least identical with "Serbia" and "Croatia," but are inextricably mingled in every province of the new kingdom, save only Serbia and Montenegro, which

are pure Serb. It was just this fact that no human power could disentangle the two, which made *partial* union so impossible a solution. If, for instance, the scheme approved by Sazonov, Izvolsky and Pašić in 1915 had been fulfilled, and if Bosnia-Herzegovina had been separated from her kinsmen farther west and annexed to Serbia, the result would have been a strong Croat irredenta in those provinces (augmented by the Moslem element), and a correspondingly strong Serb irredenta in Dalmatia and Croatia.

Meanwhile, Signor Randi has every reason to make fun of the preposterous official name "SHS," by quoting the heroine of *La Bohême*—"They call me Mimi (Jugoslavia), but my name is 'Lucia' (SHS)"—and to add the more serious warning that none of the various states which "for lack of common feeling have been linked up by a hyphen—Austria-Hungary, Sweden-Norway, Lombardo-Venetia, etc.—have had a long life." But if "under the two flags we find grouped in conflict once more two irreconcilable poles—Europeans in evolution and refractory Balcanists" (p. 31), surely we have only to remember that the latter have *age* upon their side, and cannot for ever stem a flowing tide.

Signor Randi is a very searching critic, and is fully justified in his sceptical attitude towards the new census figures of Jugoslavia. As he points out, Professor Lakatoš in his hasty estimate for the Peace Conference (1919) spoke of a population of 14,790,000, their Ministry of Social Politics in 1920 of 14,340,000, whereas the figure finally acknowledged is as low as 12,000,000. Of this Serbia proper (*i.e.*, within the frontiers of 1913) had 2,854,000, as against 2,960,000 in 1911; yet the losses resulting from the World War (*exclusive* of those in the two Balkan wars) have been officially estimated at 1,680,000. Thus, although a portion of these losses must be credited to "Southern Serbia" (*i.e.*, the territory acquired in 1912-13 and entered in the census under a separate heading), it is still almost impossible to accept the Serbian figures as even approximately accurate, and it is hard to resist the conclusion, put forward from quite serious quarters in Zagreb, that these figures have been "cooked," in order to hide the glaring injustice to Croatia and Slovenia involved in the selection of the census figures of 1910 (Austria-Hungary) and 1911 (Serbia) as the basis for the distribution of mandates at the elections to the Constituent Assembly. Obviously Serbia proper was, and still is, very much overrepresented.

This point is of all the greater importance in view of the questionable manner in which the new Yugoslav Constitution of 1921 passed into law. Signor Randi is quite right in describing it as an "attempt to wipe out history," in the interest of rigid centralism (*avrebbe cancellato la storia*). Nor does he go too far when he reminds us that it "is more reactionary than the old Constitution of the former Kingdom of Serbia. This condemnation is severe but deserved, for the anti-Liberalism of the Serbs" (here he presumably means the Pašić clique,

for it would not be true of the nation as a whole) "has no other motive save eagerness to prevent peoples who had given themselves to them spontaneously, like the Croats or Slovenes, or had been subjected by force, like the Macedonians . . . from using their liberty to oppose a violent absorption of their national character" (p. 78). At the critical division the constitution was voted by 227 to 93 in a House of 419, and this was sufficient, since the Radicals were able to enforce their contention that the necessary two-thirds majority applied to those actually present, not to the whole House (*i.e.*, only 210 were needed out of 320, instead of 280 out of 419). It cannot be denied that an overwhelming majority of the Croats and Slovenes was opposed to the new Constitution, and that Mr. Pašić, in order to secure its passage, had to buy the support of the Turks and Albanians by a compensation fund of 280 million dinars for the dispossessed landlords. Thus, by a strange irony of fate, the constitution which was hailed in some quarters as "vengeance for Kosovo," could not be without the 34 Moslem votes (incidentally, the concession to the landlords is a classical example of doing the right thing in the wrong way). On the other hand, it must never be forgotten that the exaggerated Centralism which is its most objectionable feature, could never have been upheld but for the feeble political tactics of the Croats themselves, and, above all, the fatal policy of abstention adopted by the Croatian Peasant Party under Mr. Radić, whom Signor Randi accurately describes as an "intelligent and cultured man, but headstrong, extravagant in his ideas, and often inconsequent in his actions."

The above criticisms only relate to a corner of the wide field covered by Signor Randi. But though some mistakes of detail are inevitable, his general accuracy and calmness of judgment can be vouched for. The only bad blunder which I have been able to detect is to be found in the section on the religious problem, which he regards with quite undue pessimism. Referring to the movement for a *rapprochement* between the Serbian and Anglican Churches, he states that the Foreign Office gave its encouragement and therefore "sent out first of all Archbishop Bourne, confessor to the King of England (*sic*!) and then Sir William (*sic*) Dickinson, Secretary of the League of the Churches!" His whole treatment of Italo-Yugoslav relations is dispassionate, and we share his sober hopes for a better future. Only in one respect does he allow his prejudices to run away with him when he describes the Assembly of Podgorica—which proclaimed Montenegro's incorporation with Yugoslavia—as resting on "imposture and violence." That it was an irregular and revolutionary body, like half the national assemblies of Europe in the year 1918, is of course true: but it is no less true that it represented the overwhelming opinion of Montenegro, though the contrary has often been asserted.

R. W. SETON-WATSON.

Druga Vlada Miloša i Mihaila. (The Second Reign of Princes Miloš and Michael). By Slobodan Jovanović. Belgrade (Geca Kon), 1923. pp. 287.

SERBIA received her true Constitution in 1838. It was the result of a stubborn struggle between Prince Miloš and the Chiefs in opposition, and also of foreign intervention in their quarrel. Russia as protecting Power and Turkey as suzerain played the leading part in drawing up the new Principality's constitutional charter. Speaking technically, it was a creation of the Chancellories, which took but little account of the moral and material development of the country and of the relative forces engaged—people, prince and chiefs. Indeed the people was completely ignored, and was assigned no part under the new Constitution.

The triumph of the Chiefs was followed by the abdication of Prince Miloš, who went into exile in June, 1839. In 1842 he was followed into exile by his son Prince Michael, who had also been forced to capitulate before the oligarchy. This time the rupture between the Chiefs and the Obrenović dynasty was definite, and Alexander Karagjorgjević, son of Serbia's first liberator, was elected prince. He, in his turn, fell in 1858, and involved the oligarchy also in his fall. It was the National Assembly which dethroned him and restored the Obrenović dynasty in the person of Miloš. This was also the end of the *régime* based upon the Constitution of 1838.

Before the war Mr. Jovanović published a book on these events under the title *Ustavobranitelji* (The Defenders of the Constitution); and the present volume continues the narrative down to the death of Prince Michael in 1868. The author's main object is the study of Serbia's internal development in these ten years. But though foreign policy is treated more briefly, we find in Chapter VII. a synopsis which in our opinion provides the most rational explanation of Prince Michael's very active and complicated policy, on which our information has hitherto been very inadequate. The plan of the book is admirable in its simplicity, and its style is specially deserving of praise. The author has written many books, but in no other has he shown so clearly his brilliant intellect and profound erudition.

The preface indicates that Professor Jovanović intends to prosecute his historical studies further: and in view of his capacity for work we may hope to have a further volume on the Regency and the reign of Prince Milan at no very distant date.

M. GAVRILOVIĆ.

Iz Srbije Kneza Miloša. (From the Serbia of Prince Miloš). By Tihomir R. Gjorgjević. Belgrade (Geca Kon), 1922. pp. 236.

UNDER this title Professor Gjorgjević has collected a series of articles and notes relating to the daily life and customs of the various branches of administration during the first reign of Prince Miloš (1815-1839).

This oppressive and primitive administration already contained, though in an entirely embryonic state, all the various features of a modern State—even communications, sanitary service, &c.—and there are even the first signs of artistic and literary life. These articles have already appeared in various reviews, and their sympathetic reception encouraged the author to reprint them in volume form. The result is an extremely interesting book: but what gives it special value is the fact that it is based upon documents in the State Archives at Belgrade, which were almost entirely destroyed during the late war. Consequently these studies of Mr. Gjorgjević will remain as an important source for all later writers on the period.

M. G.

The Memoirs of Alexander Izvolsky. Edited and translated by Charles Louis Seeger. London: (Hutchinson & Co.), 1923. 288 pp.

THIS is another valuable contribution to the inner history of the government of Nicholas II. Izvolsky was one of those well disposed towards Witte and does not specially help us to check the perspective given in Witte's Memoirs. But politically he is a much less complex personality, and indeed represents a single idea with its various connotations: the gravitation towards France and England, which could hardly fail to be associated with a more Liberal policy at home and a strong interest in Balkan affairs. Izvolsky's account of his upbringing, of his devotion to the memory of his ancestor, Prince Yashvill, who was actually the assassin of the Emperor Paul, and of his family connection with the Decembrists, seems a little overdone and post-revolution. The most important passage in the book does not relate to foreign policy, but to one among the several episodes which preceded the dissolution of the First Duma, in which, as we learn, Izvolsky himself played one of the two leading parts. His account of it is deeply interesting. While knowing the instinctive preferences of the Emperor, he dared to recommend to him for over an hour a memorandum written by the eminent Independent Liberal, Nicholas Lvov (not to be associated with Prince George Lvov, the first Premier after the Revolution, nor with Vladimir Lvov, the hero of the re-establishment of the Patriarchate, and the simpleton of the Kornilov-Kerensky bungle). Nicholas Lvov, of the same ancient family, married a peasant, and was a Bayard of Russian Liberalism. He rejected the tactical dictatorship of Milyukov, dissociated himself from the official Cadet attitude on the land question, and through Izvolsky recommended to the Emperor a Coalition Ministry which was to include both members of the old governmental *personnel* and representatives not merely of one, but of various groups of the so-called 'public men' who guided the Duma. Muromtsev was to be Prime Minister and Stolypin possibly Minister of the Interior; Milyukov was to have a portfolio. At one moment in this story Muromtsev, as he himself told the reviewer, was

actually sent for; but his party did not wish him to enter a Coalition, and its decision on this point was practically the ruin of the Duma. Another attempt was made after the dissolution to secure the co-operation of Milyukov, and at one moment Milyukov and Izvolsky found themselves driving about the islands on the Neva together at night. Izvolsky sketches the curious part played by General Trepov, who advised the Emperor to call a Cadet Ministry; one must imagine that Trepov expected it to lead quicker than anything else to a reaction in favour of the Government, and he had been deeply implicated in a similar disingenuous manœuvre earlier, when he promoted the extraordinary activity of the police official Zubatov in organising workmen's strikes. Trepov's position, however, and the parleys which took place between him and Milyukov, are not presented with the same clearness as the other episode.

As to foreign policy, Izvolsky has time for little more than to tell us his ideas. He died before his memoirs reached even the conclusion of the Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907, which was one of the realisations of his purpose, and there is, therefore, no account at all of his unhappy encounter with Baron Aehrenthal at Buchlau. He, however, gives us much detail on the secret Treaty of Björkö, which helps us to check Witte's account of the same extraordinary happening. Though Izvolsky spends much space to correct the account of Witte, he bears him out as to Witte's own salutary action in the matter, and in general the differences seem to be less important than Izvolsky would suggest. In any case, the Emperor had no right to sign such a treaty without consulting France, and to do so was an attempt to force France into a line of policy which was at that time quite alien to her. Incidentally, Izvolsky confirms as a matter of course the genuineness of the Willy-Nicky letters.

His sketch of Witte is rather patchy and not very convincing. He breaks off his narrative—unfortunately not to be resumed—on hearing of the death of Nicholas II., to give us his picture of his sovereign. The character of Nicholas, especially since the publication of the letters of the Empress, now stands out clearly enough and leaves little room except for such differences of judgment as might be suggested by political sympathies or personal preferences. Witte hated the Emperor; Izvolsky has an affectionate memory of him. Both men make it clear that the ruinous defect of Nicholas was an entire absence of will power. Both testify to his extraordinary gentleness and delicacy of manner; both make it clear that the atmosphere of his Court was such as could forebode nothing short of the break-up of the Russian autocracy; no external causes need be sought, and with the line that the Sovereign and his Consort followed, nothing could have saved them.

BERNARD PARES.

Forty Years of Diplomacy. By Baron R. Rosen. London : (George Allen & Unwin), 1922. 2 vols., pp. 315 + 309.

THIS very interesting, and in many ways instructive, collection of articles was published in a New York paper after the author's death and without being revised by him. Only about one-third of its contents give first-hand information drawn from a long and active diplomatic career, which began as early as 1875. For all that he had to record as to Japan, the United States, Mexico, Serbia, Bavaria and Greece, the author had to depend on the resources of his memory and apologises for possible errors. Hence the value of the book as a historic source in the narrow sense of the word, as with so many reminiscences of even more notable persons recently published, is open to criticism. As Baron Rosen is, unhappily, no longer alive, it is not possible to remind him that on 19 October (O.S.), 1903, in a dispatch No. 34, he advised against any further concessions in Manchuria; and he would have been astonished to find that so submissive a Minister as Count Lamsdorff on 18 January (O.S.), 1904, reported to the Emperor: "I maintain to the end my opinion that it is our duty to avert by all means from our fatherland the terrible disaster . . ." (of a war with Japan).

Rosen's name, though connected with such an important event as the Treaty of Portsmouth in 1905, owes its renown largely to his opponents and calumniators; most of the former belonging to the highest official circles. The author's vigorous counter-attacks are attractive by the strength of his political convictions; but the reader who does not feel himself to be in harmony with him, when he passes to the perusal of the main subject of the book—a narrative and interpretation of events from 1912 to 1918—will resent his insistence in mentioning in detail the almost numberless "golden opportunities missed for ever" because of the futility, ignorance and self-confidence of others in the face of his warnings which were "invariably confirmed by later events."

Baron Rosen's political convictions may be roughly reduced to the following :—

1. Alexander III. was ill advised when he gave up the advantages of Russia's political isolation.

2. Nicholas II. was ill advised when, in 1898, and repeatedly again in later years, he rejected Japan's request for a free hand in Korea.

3. As in 1905 peace was brought about by the friendly help of the United States, so it might have been obtained in 1916 in the same way.

4. The ruin of Russia, which was a disaster to the whole world, might have been averted if the Provisional Government had frankly entered into negotiations with the other Allied Powers to secure a general peace.

A letter from Stockholm, to Lord Bryce, dated 26 January, 1919, vividly illustrates Baron Rosen's mentality, judgment and aspirations.

A. F. MEYENDORFF.

Iranians and Greeks in South Russia. By M. I. ROSTOVTSEV. Oxford (Clarendon Press), 1922. 84s.

SOME six or seven years ago Professor Rostovtsev wrote in Russian a general account of the archaeology and history of South Russia down to the Migration period: in it he summed up his own innumerable articles on various points, brought to bear his intimate knowledge of that country and of all discoveries that have been made in it, as well as his wide acquaintance with all the ancient world, utilised everything of value which has been written on this subject and applied to the mass of facts so collected an active and critical intelligence. The resulting book was practically destroyed by the revolution; but to the great advantage of Western readers its place has been taken by the present work in English.

From earlier attempts to survey the same field it differs especially in its point of view: instead of being regarded as the obscure hinterland of the remotest recess of the Mediterranean, the Euxine region takes the middle of the stage, sending out and receiving on equal terms with the countries around it influences which cannot be neglected in the story of civilisation.

The author deals with an area now practically all Slavonic soil, and his theme is to show how it was prepared and laid open for the Slavonic occupation; but the Slavs do not come in until the end of the tale. First, in the S.W., we have the makers of the Tripolye pots, the highest development of *Bandkeramik*, with evident European connections, whereas the art of the Eastern region N. of the Caucasus is brought into line with Sumer and predynastic Egypt. The Cimmerians appear in the great movements of the VIIIth century B.C. Rostovtsev puts them down as Thracians; though the Iranians are the heroes of his tale, he insists upon the persistence of the Thracian element upon the Cimmerian Bosphorus right on to the time of Constantine. But the Scythians are his favourites: he represents them as having established well organised semi-feudal states based upon the agricultural exploitation of subject tribes, which produced raw materials that could be exchanged in the markets of the world for Greek products. This trade made the wealth of Olbia and later of Panticapacum, which supplied suitable objects of art and luxury. These the Scythian grandees were quite capable of appreciating, being all but the equals of their cousins the Medes and Persians, whose general views of religion and of kingship they shared. Their art, likewise kin to that of Iran, was perhaps bolder and had a yet more pronounced love for beast forms, stylised and made decorative, Iranian too its brilliant colour effects, the most characteristic material being gold with inlays of semi-precious stone.

Alexander's conquests diverted the Greek demand for the Euxine corn and weakened the economic position of the Scythian aristocracy, whose very civilisation perhaps lessened their warlike power: they no

longer could resist the pressure of the Sarmatæ on their eastern borders; their centre shifted westward to the Crimea and the mouths of the Danube. These Sarmatæ were Iranians like themselves, Rostovtsev sharply distinguishes them from the matriarchal Sauro-matæ of Herodotus. In a most interesting way he traces the new wave coming down from the N.E. by Orenburg to the Kuban region and the mouth of the Don. It brings with it different weapons and a different phase of the beast-style, akin to that which stretched across N. Asia to the edge of China. When the new invaders found their level, something of the old commerce revived and the Bosphorus kingdom, half Greek and half Iranian, once more flourished and developed an art half Greek and half Iranian, which just suited the tastes of its barbaric customers. The later tribes of Sarmatæ were called Alans, and it was they who in the IIIrd century A.D. mingled with the Goths and other Germans who had reached the Euxine from the N.W. The Goths traded with Rome and Greece, but the Huns, new invaders from the East, forced the mixed tribes to break the Roman dam and flood the empire, not, as we are wont to think, with savages, but with peoples who had a definite culture and art of their own: this art, spread throughout N. Europe and then carried by the invaders all over the Mediterranean world, is the direct descendant of the Scythic beast style, and one parent of medieval art in Europe. When the Hun wave broke and vanished, it left South Russia swept almost bare of inhabitants. This gave an opening to the Eastern Slavs, who in the dark centuries between the IVth and the IXth spread over a country in which the traditions of worldwide trade still survived. The trade was the exploiting of the people of the country by foreigners, but it meant the keeping open of ancient routes and the formation of trade centres or towns. Interruptions by nomad invaders were serious, but not fatal; some, like the Khazars, were prepared to trade, others could be bought by tribute or pierced by convoys. So when the curtain lifts again with the story of Askold and Dir and Rurik, there is nothing new in the lively commerce and wide knowledge of the lie of the land it presupposes. But now at last Russia has fixed settlers who will become masters in their own land and keep out alien exploiters. Professor Rostovtsev has developed this last thesis, which is of peculiar importance for Slavists, in "Les Origines de la Russie kiévienne" (*Revue des Études Slaves*, Vol. II., p. 5).

"Iranians and Greeks" is splendidly produced, with 33 plates, many illustrations in the text and a clear map: the objects figured have been chosen, as far as possible, from such as had not appeared in former works: some very important things are given for the first time in a photographic rendering. The bibliography supplies much that is not indicated elsewhere. The only drawback to the book is its price.

ELLIS H. MINNS.

Dr. Max Ebert, *Südrussland im Altertum*. Kurt Schröder, Bonn, 1921. 8vo. 436 pp. Quite a good summary, bringing things very fairly up to date, and very cheap. The account of pre-Scythic South Russia is particularly useful. Dr. Ebert has done a certain amount of excavating on the lower Bug and has a good knowledge of the country. It is strange that he follows Filov in assigning to Thracians the Scythic things found in Bulgaria. The bibliography is of special value for the books published in Germany and Austria since 1914.

E. H. M.

Chetki (Rosaries), 9th edition, (St. Petersburg (sic), 1923); *Belaya Staya* (The White Flock), 4th edition, (St. Petersburg (sic), 1923); *Anno Domini*, 2nd, augmented, edition, (St. Petersburg, (sic), 1923). By Anna Akhmatova.

ANNA AKHMATOVA, whose complete poems have just appeared in a new edition of the "Petropols" press, is, since the death of Blok, admittedly the greatest living Russian poet. Her first book, "*Evening*," appeared in 1912. It was, appropriately enough, preceded by a preface of M. Kuzmin, for Kuzmin was the first to inaugurate the reaction against the vague and merely musical poetry of the Symbolists, and to introduce a more direct, concrete and exact style in verse. Anna Akhmatova brought this new style to perfection. "*Evening*" met with enthusiastic approval in the small circle of young poets who were inspired by the same ideas of poetical concreteness and directness. But it was not before 1914 that she won the attention of a wider public. In that year appeared "*Chetki*," which included a reprint of most poems of the earlier book. Its success was enormous. It has within nine years gone through nine editions, a success unparalleled by any other book of Russian verse—and this in spite of the general slump in book-production between 1917 and 1921. It was this slump that prevented the adequate circulation of the "*White Flock*," as a result of which Akhmatova is still known mainly by her first book. But her second and third books mark a great advance in poetical conception and style; she had completely freed herself, by about 1915, of the prettiness and *mièvrerie* of some of her early lyrics, and much of "*Anno Domini*" is written in a style as noble and as severe as the later work of Pushkin or the Sonnets of Milton. Most of Akhmatova's lyrics are very short, from 8 to 20 lines, concise, pithy, terse, sometimes even attaining the compactness of a Greek epigram. Her subject is, to a great extent, love, but some of her most conspicuous masterpieces speak of the wider life of the nation. Among them are the two prophetic pieces inscribed "July 1914," and a series of poignant *Leitgedichte* written in the terrible years of 1917-1920. Akhmatova is one of the few living Russian poets whose appeal is at once wide and narrow,—for

her subject-matter is more broadly human and national than that of any other poet; and her craftsmanship is the delight and the amazement of the initiated. Her work has all the necessary essentials to become a *κτῆμα ἐς αἰὲν*, and she is in fact already a national classic. It is greatly to be regretted that nothing of hers has been rendered into English, but this, it seems, would require a master of language equal to herself. And of such masters legion is not the name.

D. S. MIRSKY.

The Moscow Art Theatre Abroad.

OWING to the difficult living conditions in Moscow, a part of the *personnel* of the Moscow Art Theatre, including Olga Knipper-Chekhova, Chekhov's widow, V. I. Kachalov, L. D. Leonidov and I. N. Bersenev, decided in the summer of 1919 to leave for the south of Russia. After visiting Kharkov, the Crimea and Georgia, this travelling company acted in Constantinople, Sofia, Belgrade, Zagreb, Vienna and reached Prague in the spring of 1921. *Artisty Moskovskago Khudozhestvennago Teatra za Rubezhom* ("The Artists of the Moscow Art Theatre Abroad," 1922, published in Russian by "Nasha Rech," Prague II., Katerinská ul. 40), is the work of prominent members of the company with the addition of articles by the well-known writers V. Kadyshch-Amfiteatrov, Eugene Chirikov and Sergius Makovski. The book is quarto size and illustrated with excellent photographs, including full-page portraits of V. I. Nemirovich-Danchenko, of V. I. Kachalov as Hamlet and a reproduction in three colours of Serov's pastel of K. S. Stanislavski.

M. N. Germanova contributes an impressive article "*Our Theatre*," in which she vividly describes the great enthusiasm and splendid *esprit de corps* of the actors and actresses of the Art Theatre. A clear idea of the extraordinary personal influence of K. S. Stanislavski and V. I. Nemirovich-Danchenko on the company during the numerous and very exacting rehearsals, can be gained from two articles by E. Krasnopolskaya. V. I. Kachalov relates in a life-like manner how while still a member of M. M. Baradai's company, he received at Kazan, in January 1900, an unexpected telegram from Moscow offering him a position in the Art Theatre, how the provincial actors regarded this unorthodox enterprise at Moscow very unfavourably and how finally he himself was converted from the older declamatory style of acting by Stanislavski. In an arresting article on Kachalov's Hamlet, Sergius Makovski controverts the criticism that the Russian Hamlet is un-Shakespearean and merely a close relative of Rudin. Gordon Craig's symbolist setting of "Hamlet" proved to be impracticable on the stage in Moscow in 1910, but traces of his influence may still be noticed in the acting of this play. The outstanding fact, however,

is that Kachalov's Hamlet is a decided return to genuine Shakespearean realism.

The memory and tradition of Chekhov, of course, permeate the *Moscow Art Theatre*, and his widow's reminiscences of her first meeting with him and his family and of the early performances of the "Sea Gull," "Uncle Vanya" and "Three Sisters" are of real historical interest. Madame Chekhov's article contains, in addition to this, a description of her husband's last hours, which has not before appeared in print. Chekhov inherited from his family a peculiar liking for humorous situations. Clowns and tricksters of any kind never failed to appeal to him. "Even a few hours before his death," writes Madame Chekhov, "he invented a story which forced me to laugh. We were at Badenweiler. After three long, anxious days he felt better towards the evening. He sent me to take a walk round the park, for I had not left him all that time, and when I returned he worried himself because I did not go for some supper, whereupon I replied that the gong had not yet sounded. As it turned out afterwards, we had not noticed the gong. Anton Pavlovich began to invent a tale about a particularly fashionable spa where there were many well-fed, stout bankers, ruddy-cheeked Englishmen and Americans, with healthy appetites and fond of good food. They had come back from their day's outing, some from a drive, others from long walks, in short they had come in from all directions and were gathering together with the pleasant prospect of dining well after the physical exertion of the day. And then, all of a sudden, it became known that the chef had run away and that there was no meal to be had at all. I was lying down on the sofa to have a few moments sleep after the anxiety of the last few days and laughed with all my heart. I could not grasp the thought that in a few hours I should be standing beside his dead body Anton Pavlovich quietly and peacefully passed away into the other world. At the beginning of the night he woke up and for the first time in his life he himself asked that the doctor should be sent for The doctor arrived and ordered some champagne for the patient. Anton Pavlovich sat down and in a somewhat significant and loud tone said to the doctor in German (Chekov knew very little German): "Ich sterbe." He then took a wine-glass and with his wonderful smile turned to me and said: "It is a long time since I had any champagne." Quietly draining the glass to the bottom he lay down gently on his left side and soon dropped into everlasting silence Nothing broke the awful stillness of the night except an immense black moth which seemed to burst its way in like a whirlwind, dashing itself painfully against the burning electric lamps and flitting madly about the room"

Prague, March, 1922.

H. T. CHESHIRE.

Otelo. Hamlet. [*Dela Viljema Šekspira.*] Serbian translation by Svetislav Stefanović. Belgrade (Vreme), 1921. 10 dinars each. (xvi + 143 pp. and xxi + 169 pp.).

IF these two tastefully produced and well-printed little volumes are an earnest of the translator's intention to make a complete version of our greatest poet, students of Shakespeare both here and in Jugoslavia will heartily wish Mr. Stefanović well in a task for which he is so admirably fitted. Serbian critics have already written in high terms of his version, and compared it most favourably with the older one of L. Kostić. This was, indeed, only to be expected, because Mr. Stefanović is not only a poet, but also a thorough Shakespearian scholar, who has spared no pains to acquaint himself with the best interpretations of all disputed passages. Where the reading finally selected appeared to need justification or explanation, the pithy notes at the back of each volume supply the Serbian reader with all that is required. The introductions give a short account of Shakespeare's art and his sources.

A careful examination of two acts of each play has convinced the present reviewer that the translation most faithfully represents the original. The text and style agree wonderfully with Shakespeare; where Shakespeare is simple and unvarnished, the Serbian is the same, and where bombast or a florid vocabulary is typical of a character (*e.g.*, Iago), Mr. Stefanović matches the tone. There is no trace of an attempt to make the language of the translation archaic in the way that Shakespeare has unfortunately become archaic, and so more or less unintelligible, to the present British generation. The complete avoidance of all "learned" words—I noted only "plan" and "tema" (theme) in the whole of the first act of *Hamlet*: a contrast indeed to the language of the introductions!—and the presence of the commoner Turkish loan words, no doubt conjure up to the Serbian reader all the pleasing dignity and robustness of his own native ballads.

Stefanović's verse flows easily, with real swing and eloquence, and full use is made of the harmonious and liquid sounds in which Serbian so fortunately abounds. What a beautiful rendering, for example, of

And now no soil nor cautel doth besmire

The virtue of his will: "

" I nikakva mrlja ni varka ne prlja

Vrlinu njegove volje.

Shakespeare's language is so magnificent, his vocabulary so vast and his style so condensed, that no one would wish to see a milk-and-water translation. Into this danger Mr. Stefanović has not fallen. It is, however, open to question whether he has not occasionally erred on the other side. His determination to be literal and to reproduce Shakespeare's vigour and richness have perhaps caused his version to become stilted in a few places. "The goodness of the night upon you, friends" (*Othello*, I., 2. 35) is strange English to-day,

but "Dobrota noći na vas, drugovi" seems an unnecessary imitation. The clumsiness of

. Hold your hands
Both you of my inclining, and the rest

in the same scene is, however, not reproduced in the simple

Vi moji, i vi drugi, sebi ruke!

"Sedite dole" (*Hamlet*, I., 1) seems suspiciously un-Serbian, and a dog version of the English "sit down."

But tameness of rendering is very rare. An examination of *Othello* brought to light only one passage in the first act where this charge might fairly be brought—

And I must be be-lee'd and calmed
By debtor-and-creditor:

is rendered by

Ja moram da se smirim, skunjim pred tim
Duguje-prima.

And here Mr. Stefanović could probably defend his simplification of the original metaphor!

The translation of *Hamlet* is not quite so free from blame in this respect.

. Zato sam ga
Pozvo da noćas s nama stražari

is weak compared with the fine (and translatable!) "watch the minutes of the night." "Udaljuje se" for "stalks away," "hitna žurba" for "sweaty haste," "je sabrao grupu drskih beskućnika" for "shark'd up a list of lawless resolute" are further instances of watered-down Shakespeare.

Rare though that sin is, any misunderstanding of the English text is still rarer. In *Othello*, I., 2, 44-47, the original (including the various readings) does not justify Stefanović's translation (with "bih"), and "kričahu, jecahu" seem wrong for the "did squeak and gibber" of Hamlet. Does the "ungracious pastor" referred to by Ophelia really mean "without grace" or "godless," as Mr. Stefanović renders it (bezbožni)?

It is unreasonable to expect an equivalent of plays on words, but Mr. Stefanović's uncommon success even there makes one regret that he did nothing to convey the double sense of "marry" in

IAGO. He's married.
CAS. To who?

Re-enter OTHELLO.

JAGO. Marry, to—Come, captain, will you go?

The neat skill of a rendering like

. taj običaj je
Časniji kad se gazi no kad se pazi.

for "a custom more honoured in the breach than the observance" reconciles us with occasional shortcomings, for the rhyme proves

that the translator not only knows his Shakespeare, but also the language of to-day which has made a proverb of this line. The prose dialogue, the rhymed couplets at the end of the scenes and, above all, the songs are also admirably translated. In short, Mr. Stefanović's versions may be confidently recommended as poetical, conscientious and scholarly.

N. B. JOPSON.

Vasilissa the Wise. A dramatic fairy tale by A. V. Lunacharski (the Soviet Commissar of Education). Authorised translation by Leonard A. Magnus. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. 3s. 6d. net.

WITH a preface which explains that the work was written as a kind of sleepless holiday in the intervals of Mr. Lunarsky's official duties.

It is unquestionably a very remarkable production with luxuriant imagery, and testifies that the author is by no means the ordinary Minister of Education. The translation seems to be very successful in its freshness and simplicity.

THERE has been sent to us a copy of the paper *Bezbozhnik* (The Atheist), published in Moscow. The paper and the get-up are better than anything that was possible two years ago : but it is the most scurrilous mockery imaginable, directed against religion in general, and specially against Christianity. N. Bukharin, the well-known Bolshevik thinker and writer, contributes an article on "The Fight with the International Gods." Gross caricatures mock at the Immaculate Conception, and there is a long article under the title "Whose Son?" A workman is shown being bled to death, with the title "Take, eat, this is my Body." Another picture shows a priest standing on a workman, with the title, "On this Rock I will build my Church." The last page shows a Russian workman laughing at the Devil and saying : "Your handiwork is played out"—the one statement in the *Bezbozhnik* with which it is possible to agree.

B. P.

War and Peace. By Leo Tolstoy. Translated by Louise and Aylmer Maude. 3 Vols. Oxford University Press. 2s. net per Vol.

A REPRINT of a well-known translation which was known to have the approval of the author, with an introduction by Mr. Aylmer Maude. This edition is well printed and of a very handy size. The transliteration of Russian words is consistent and good.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES.

RECENT BULGARIAN LITERATURE.

[NOTE.—In the following notes the scientific transcription has been adopted throughout, but, owing to the transitional state of spelling, the hard sign has been represented by ' and the character for which it is so often substituted by q.—L. C. W.]

Bezplaten Katalog na knigoizdatelstvo "Cvët." Mario Mariani. Vednaž samo v života i nikoga veče. Pp. 19. This catalogue reproduces the preface to the translation of M. Mariani's book named, and adds a list of the translation and native literature issued by Cvët. They also give numerous specimens of the rather startling illustrations to the largely sensational works translated.

Babev, Dimitr. Našitě Pisateli : II. Izdanie. Sofia (Knigoizdatelstvo "Cvët"), 1918. 6vo. Pp. 95. (In Biblioteka "Cvët.") Price : 4 leva. This is a very brief account of modern Bulgarian literature. Its great merit is that, besides giving an account of such inevitable figures as Ivan Vazov, P. Slaveikov and P. Todorov, it shows the outside public the standing of men like A. Strašimirov, P. K. Javorov, K. Hristov and S. Mihajlovski, while not ignoring others.

Sakǵzova, Nadja : Muzikalnost v poezijata na Javorova. S přegovor ot Professor Bojan Penev. (Published by the Nadja Sakǵzova fund of the students' society Bělo More.) Sofia (Pridvorna Pečatnica), 1920. 9½". 16 pp. Price : 5 leva. As Professor Penev explains, the talented author of this study died before its appearance in book form. Possessed of unusual critical faculties and herself also creative as a poet, the reader of this book—though it has not had the last touches of its author—can see that a rare talent essayed the task. After a formal analysis of the rhythm of Javorov, the inner character of his work is set out and the conclusion follows. He is the first musician in Bulgarian literature of whom she makes the felicitously worded forecast : "His poems will eternally sing in the soul of the Bulgarian." One should add that this article had appeared in the periodical *Zlatorog*.

Sjuz na B'lgarskitě Pisateli. Sbornik. I. Edited by Al. Balabanov, N. Atanasov and D. Podvrzačev. Sofia ("Cvët"), 1920. 9". Price 30 leva. Beginning with a facsimile reproduction of a poem of Vazov's, "My Path," this collection continues with an article by him to correct a false conclusion as to his first published poem, and gives a succession of pieces in prose and verse by various hands. The few names chosen for mention here should suffice to show the success of this Bulgarian *cenacle* in uniting the country's talent. Besides Vazov and the editors we have Andreičin, Arnaudov, Babev, I. E. Gešov (on Vazov and politics), S. Drinov, Professor S. Mladenov and others. This raises one's expectations about No. 2.

Rainov, Nikolai : Kniga za caretě. Skazaniya za mir i braň. (No. 11.) Sofia (S. Atanasov), 1918. 7¾". With illustrations and a cover design by the author. The first number of this collection of stories bore the title "A Vision of Old Bulgaria," and this one consists of two stories, Tsar Peter and Peter Osogovec. They are linked by the fact that the hero of the second story lives in the reign of Tsar Peter.

Runevski, Stefan : Našenci. (Razkazi.) Sofia ("Cvət"), 1919. 8". Biblioteka Rodna Literatura. Kniga 4. Price : 4 leva. This is a selection of short stories by a writer who died prematurely young, and preceded by a short life of the author.

Strašimirov, A. : Změj (Krajdunavska pověst.) Sofia ("Cvət"), 1919. 8". 46 pp. Biblioteka Rodna Literatura. Kniga I. Price : 3 leva. This short story is accompanied by the author's portrait and a life, unfortunately imperfect in the copy in our hands. It is interesting to remember that he was an authorised war correspondent during the European War.

Babev, Dimitr : Prikazki za života i za smërta. Sofia ("Cvət"), 1919. 8". 64 pp. Biblioteka Rodna Literatura. Kniga 2. Price : 4 leva. Port. These selections from a larger book of poems by this young writer contain some pieces dating back to his student days at Brussels University. Born in 1880, he studied at Sofia as well as Brussels. A notice appears above of his book on modern Bulgar literature, and he has other work to his credit.

Botjov (Botev), Hr. Stihotvorenija : Avtentično izdanie s kritičeski belžki ot Dr. K. Krstev. Sofia (Al. Paskalev I. S-ie), c. 1920. 8½". 94 pp. Price : 6 leva. The poems occupy 41 pages and the critical notes, the end of which Dr. Krstev dates March, 1919, take up all the rest of the space. The importance of Botev as a factor in the history of modern Bulgarian literature is ample justification for such a treatment of what is his principal contribution to his native literature. The notes are careful and useful and, so far as tested, remarkably free from misprints, though a serious one in the text is noted at the end.

Todorov, Petko : V' Getsimanskata gradina. Edna pšeni. Dēdo Mateja. Po Zatva. Kamani. Sofia ("Cvət"), 1919. 8". 48 pp. Biblioteka Rodna Literatura. Kniga 3. Port. These short pieces in prose form are hard to describe, because some are marked by their subtitle as prose-poems, while others are too fragmentary to enable one to judge how they would ultimately turn out. The first category of pieces, by which one alone ought to judge his work, suggests a certain kinship with the Indian poet Tagore, to whom his portrait seems to show a striking resemblance. The author certainly deserves watching.

Sbornik za Narodni Umotvorenija i Narodopis. Izdava B'lgarskata Akademija na Naukitē. Kn. 27, etc. Sofia, 1913, etc. This is the excellent successor of the ministerial journal, *Sbornik za Narodni Umotvorenija, Nauka i Knižnina*. In its new form it is no less wide in its scope, and the name of the national academy, the former Literary Society naturally has a greater scientific value.

B'lgarski Hudožestveni Starini. The two parts of which this work consists appear to have been published in 1907 by the Ministry of National Education. So far it consists of reproductions of works of art. No more has been issued.

B'lgarski Starini. Sofia, 1913. Transferred in 1913 from the Archaeographical Commission of the Ministry of National Education to the National Academy, the series was very badly hit by the Great War, and these three numbers are the latest product. One early Slav monument here is a letter of the Patriarch Photius to the first Christian Prince of Bulgaria, Boris of Tyrnovo. Another consists of 18th century Bulgarian works written in Greek characters.

Teodorov-Balan, A. : B'lgarski Knigopis za sto godini, 1806-1905. Materiali S'bra i nar. A. T. Balan. Sofia, 1909. 8vo. pp. 1667. This book supersedes its only predecessor not merely for its extension of the period covered, but also because of the fullness and clearness of the matter given by its well-known author. Its modest title should not mislead.

Spisanie. Sofia, 1911, etc. This is the third start of a periodical of this name by the same body. Its first effort was at Braila as the Bulgarian Literary Society, in exile. The second is the continuation of this at Sofia. This third one is started with the change of name to Bulgarian Academy. The contents are of much the same character throughout.

Sbornik na B'lgarskata Akademija na Nauki. Sofia, 1913, etc. This is, of course, modelled on the Russian Academy's Sbornik.

Lětopis na Akademija, 1914, etc. This recalls analogous publications elsewhere.

Avtobiografija na Sofroni Vračanski. (Edited by Dr. P. N. Orěškov.) Sofia, 1914. 119 pp. This is an important historical document.

Kacarov, G. I., and Dečev, D.: Sofia, 1915. pp. vi., 199. This consists of a translation into Bulgarian of the classical sources for the history and geography of Bulgaria.

Stoilov, A. P.: Pokazalec na pečatanite přez xix věk B'lgarskija narodne pesni. Sofia, 1916. Here Parts I. and II. of the work carry on the story to 1878, and the value of such a record is great.

Ivanov, Jurdan : B'lgaritě v Makedonija. Izdirvanija i dokumenti za těhnoto poteklo, ezik i narodnost. With an ethnographical map and statistics. 2nd edition. Sofia, 1917. This book, like its six predecessors here, is published by the Bulgarian Academy. Its author is convinced that all the Slavs (and he would probably add many of the Greek-speaking people) of Macedonia are Bulgars. Without denying the existence of transition forms in the language and social life there, one would recommend as a corrective T. R. Gjorgjić's book on Macedonia.

Ivanov, Jurdan : B'lgarski Starini iz Makedonija, s'brani ot J. Ivanov. Sofia, 1908. pp. v., 310. This is a competent collection of objects of an antiquarian character whose provenance is Macedonia. They are not necessarily things which we should all regard as Bulgarian in the narrowly national sense. It is a publication of the Bulgarian Academy.

Nedev, N. : Dunav ot glediště na s'vrěmenno rěčno konvencionalno pravo. Sofia, 1917. pp. iv., 196. Naturally the *régime* of the Danube is as important to Bulgaria as to any other riparian state. Those who notice the date at which the Academy issued it will feel the great importance it possesses as an expression of the problem before the then rulers, if not of their views.

Zlatarski, V. N. : Istorija na B'lgarskata d'ržava přez srědnitě věkove. Sofia, 1918, etc. This first volume of the eagerly awaited work of the great historian is of such intrinsic importance that it would not be fair to pass judgment on it before the appearance of the second one, when it is to be hoped that it will receive the careful technical treatment so great a theme deserves in such a case.

Miletič, L. : Razorenija na Trakiskitě B'lgari přez 1913 godina. With 65 illustrations and a map. Sofia, 1918. 348 pp. The events dealt with in this book give pause to any who say that Thrace is wholly Turkish, for it actually shows not quite in harmony with the "case" of Bulgaria in 1913 and during the Great War, Greek elements as well as Slav, in important parts of Thrace. The fact that these have either been massacred or driven into exile only makes the Turks' case worse from the strictly scientific point of view, which should surely supersede rule of thumb as well as that of yataghan. Its data doubtless deserve a critical handling, for which there is no room here.

Teodorov-Balan, A. : S. Kliment Ohridski v knižni pomen i v naučnoto direne. Sofia, 1919. 117 pp. This is an academic address to commemorate the Saint's millenary.

Popov, Kiril G. : La Bulgarie Economique, 1879-1911. Sofia, 1920. pp. vi., 520. This curtailed translation from a Bulgarian original which is not now accessible is intended to convey the main facts as to Bulgaria's progress since the liberation.

Morfov, B. : Stopanstvova neto na B'lgarskitě d'ržavni želěznice. Sofia, 1920. pp. vi., 114. This is a technical work by an engineer on one side of the railway policy of Bulgaria.

Stefanov, Konstantin : Petdesetgodišnjat Jubilej na S. S. Bobčev, 1871-1921. Portrait. Sofia, 1921. 148 pp. A "Festschrift" in honour of one of the great figures in modern Bulgarian literature.

Narodni Etnografičeskijat Muzej . . . Izvēstija . . . Bulletin du Musée Ethnographique National. Sofia, 1921, etc. This is a new periodical started to keep the outside public aware of the Museum's work.

L. C. WHARTON.

NOTES ON OTHER SLAVONIC REVIEWS.

DURING 1922 two important scientific periodicals have been started in Prague: *Slavia* and *Atheneum*. The former is edited by Professors O. Hujer and M. Murko, and is intended to carry on the tradition of the veteran Professor Jagić's *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, which was discontinued in 1920. In the first number Jagić himself commemorates the centenary of Dobrovský's *Institutiones* (1822), which laid the foundations of Slavonic philology. He wished his paper to be printed in Czech, the language of "the nation from whom the first idea and the earliest works on such studies as ours had originated." A. Belić, of Belgrade University, writes on the Protoslav language. Prince N. Trubetsky suggests an ingenious, but rather daring etymology for certain Slavonic words. N. Durnovo investigates the phonology of an old Galician Gospel of 1144. F. Ramovš discusses Slovene loan-words and place-names. S. Ivšić, Glagolitic translations from Old Czech. Professor Lyatsky gives an entertaining account of Goncharov's *tour du monde*, notably his impressions of London. J. Jakubec considers the position of President Masaryk in Czech literature, and his moral influence as a teacher. Professor Polívka criticises Conev (Tsonev)'s unlucky attempt at a new classification of Slavonic languages.

Atheneum, edited by Professors V. Mathesius and Emanuel Rádl (as a continuation of the pre-war *Nové Atheneum*), devotes its first, and most of its second, number to Slavonic studies. M. Weingart, of Bratislava University, deals with the unity of the Slavs, as above all a sociological problem, which cannot be solved by applying merely linguistic tests. M. Hýsek writes on the Slavonic spirit, as illustrated by K. Světlá, the Czech woman novelist. Paul Novgorodtsev discusses the crisis of the West and Dostoyevsky's ideas on Russia's mission. The cry of discontent with European civilisation, coupled with the plea for solidarity, prove that Western thinkers are approximating Russian ways of thinking. André Mazon, of Strasbourg University, surveys Slavonic studies in France since 1840. F. Chudoba, of Brno (formerly of King's College), gives a parallel survey of Slavonic studies in Britain, with special reference to our own School. K. Kadlec writes upon co-operation between the various Slavonic Academies and the pre-war obstacles. In the second number there are articles by A. Pražák (Bratislava) on Slovak peculiarities and the romantic Panslavism of the Magyar period, by F. Tichý on the relations of the Hungarian Ruthenes with the Czechs, by F. Sedláček on modern Serbian literary criticism, by A. Brückner on Slav studies in Germany, and the inaugural lectures of Professors Frantsev and Baudouin de Courtenay at Prague University.

The *Srpski Književni Glasnik*, necessarily suspended during the war, now fills its old place in Serbian intellectual life. At first edited by those two eminent writers, Bogdan Popović and Slobodan Jovanović, its conduct was transferred early last year by them and the committee of management to Svetislav Petrović and Miodrag Ibrovac. Among the more important articles may be noted that on Molière, by Bogdan Popović (1 February, 1922); "Secret Diplomacy and Diplomatic Secrets," by Živojin Balugdžić, Yugoslav Minister at Athens and formerly

confidential secretary to King Peter (1 March); a series of 13 articles on Serbo-Croat relations by a number of outstanding writers and politicians of all parties (beginning 1 April); articles on the Tsaritsa and the Emperor Charles, by Jovan M. Jovanović, formerly Minister in Vienna (1913-14) and London (1916-19); the "Centenary of Vuk Karadžić," by P. Popović (1 July); "Cultural Sketches from Medieval Ragusa," by M. Rešetar (16 July); "The Serbian Towns under Prince Miloš" (two articles), by Tihomir Gjorgjević; "The Foundations of Yugoslav Civilisation," by Jovan Cvijić (1 November); and an estimate of the Voivodes Putnik and Mišić, by M. D. Lazarević (16 March). We are interested to note that no less than three of the boys educated in England by the Serbian Relief Fund—A. Vidaković and G. Kozomarić, Oxford graduates, and Vladita Popović, a Cambridge graduate—are frequent contributors to the *Glasnik*.

Special reference must also be made to *Nova Europa*, which was founded at Zagreb in the winter of 1920, on the avowed model of *The New Europe*, with similar aims and in an exactly identical format. Since then it has appeared three times a month, in a mixture of the two alphabets, and occupies a unique position among the periodicals of South-east Europe. Among many noteworthy contributions to its columns may be mentioned the special New Year number entitled *Crkva i Država* (Church and State), and containing articles by Archbishop Bauer of Zagreb, Bishop Jeglič of Ljubljana, the Orthodox Bishop Irinej of Bačka, Dr. Korošec and Father M. Jakšić; the special number on Alexander Blok's poetry and the Russian Art Theatre; the article of I. Kolbe on "The Relations of Yugoslavs and Bulgars" (11 December); the double number on Yugoslav Music (21 September); the special numbers on President Masaryk (11 September); and the Salonica Trial (21 October), to each of which Professor Seton-Watson contributed; the important series of economic studies from the pen of I. Belin (e.g., *The Problem of Our Valuta* on 11 February); and the articles on 1 March by MM. Avramović and Korošec on their respective parties, the Zemljičoradnici and the Slovenačka Pučka Stranka. Special attention is always devoted to the literary and artistic movements of the younger generation, to the Sokols and their ideals, and to student opinion at the Universities—always a very important factor among the Yugoslavs. Its editor-in-chief is Milan Ćurčin, well known to all British friends of Serbia during his three years' exile in London; and he is ably assisted by Dr. Lazar Popović, M. Kostrenčić and L. Pitamic (for Slovenia).

Another valuable new Yugoslav publication is *Narodna Starina*, edited by Dr. Josip Matasović (No. 1, April, 1922, Zagreb, 16 dinars). Its more important contents are articles on the antiquities of the city of Zagreb, by the editor (illustrated); on Roman Law in Dalmatia and Pannonia, by Professor Šišić; on early medieval Dalmatian architecture, by Ć. M. Iveković; on Church Chalice, by Dr. Gjuro Szabó; and illustrated notes on the Zagreb Ethnographic Museum.

Przegląd Warszawski (*The Warsaw Review*, October, 1921-September 1922).—Perhaps the most notable among the achievements which point to the existence of a hard-working national entity of Poland is the appearance of the September copy of the *Przegląd Warszawski* (*The Warsaw Review*) which closes the first year of this remarkable monthly, reminding one so vividly, by its form and arrangement, of the *Mercure de France*. Each copy is divided in two main sections. The first one contains artistic contributions and original essays. As to the former, they are neither numerous nor very striking; one novel, two short stories, two or three poems, and a few translations, among which the outstanding feature is the Polish version of Shelley's "Prometheus Unbound," by one of the greatest

living Polish poets, Jan Kasprwicz. As to the essays, these number 56 in all, making an average of 4-5 in each copy. To give but a general idea of the variety of the subjects, it must be sufficient here to point out that historical and sociological problems are treated in 12 essays; the same number deals with foreign literature, in the first place English, French and Italian, with Shakespeare, Shelley, Byron, Keats, Molière and Dante as their particular subjects. A special mention must be made of the essay called "The First Encounter between Romanticists and Classicists," which gives an amazingly rich and instructive picture of the literary movements in France and Italy of the XVIth and XVIIth centuries. Its author, the most eminent classical scholar among the younger generation in Poland, Prof. T. Sinko, of Cracow University, is well on the road to become a Polish Saintsbury, as much on account of his erudition as of the versatility and vitality of mind.

Ten essays are devoted to matters æsthetic and to what may be termed generally the theory of literature. Among them the most striking contribution is a paper on "Rationalism and Mysticism in the Great Improvisation of Adam Mickiewicz," in that it indicates a new departure in Polish criticism, which tries to free itself from its former nationalism and to take a longer view. The history of Polish literature is represented by nine essays; each of them gives a more or less synthetical account of the recent results of literary research work. Four essays deal with more conspicuous achievements of modern Polish literature. Finally, there are five essays which would come under the heading "varia"; the most impressive among them is that of Mr. W. Orkan, an eminent poet and novelist; it is entitled "Along the Coast of the Polish Sea," and it brings to light the fact (so carefully suppressed by the former masters of the Baltic sea-coast) that Polish life, with its old language and tradition, is far from being extinct in these parts now restored to Poland. These discoveries—or rather findings—made by a Polish peasant-poet, together with the now famous rhapsodical novel of Stefan Zeromski, *The Wind from the Sea*, and with his strange half-rhapsodical, half-didactic prose-poem called "Wisla" (the river Vistula), mark the intellectual reunion and absorption of these old Polish parts in the body politic of Poland.

The second section, bearing a general title, "The Chronicle," comprises reviews of the current publications on the following subjects: the history and bibliography of Polish literature; modern Polish poetry, novel, drama, music, the art of painting and architecture; political history, geography, ethnology, archæology and statistics; translations from foreign literatures (ancient and modern); the Russian and Oriental literatures; politics, the history of the great war, the revived literature on military matters, and, finally, the works relative to codification and public instruction.

K. F. S.

THE ANGLO-RUSSIAN LITERARY SOCIETY.

THE Anglo-Russian Literary Society, founded in 1893 by Mr. E. A. Cazalet, Sir Donald Mackenzie Wallace and others, was the first Society in England formed specially to develop the interest taken in Russian culture. It possessed many valuable members and connections both in England and in Russia, and published proceedings which were widely circulated in both countries. The honoured President and Secretary of the Society, Mr. E. A. Cazalet, on whom has fallen the main brunt of this long and valuable work, has now arranged that the Society should transfer its home from the Imperial Institute to King's College, where in future will be kept its library of over a thousand volumes. By the request of Mr. Cazalet, Professor Pares succeeds him in the management of the Society.

The first meeting since the transfer to King's College took place on Tuesday, 6 February, 1923, when Prince D. Svyatopolk-Mirsky gave an interesting address on "The Vitality of Russian Literature To-day." Prince Mirsky dealt both with poetry and with the novel, and showed that the present dark period of Russian history has in no way clouded the genius and inspirations of Russian letters. He dwelt on the great privations and hardships that have been the lot of Russian writers, as well as of all the educated class, and mentioned the deaths of Korolenko (1921), Rozanov (1919), Andreyev (1919), Blok (1921), and Gumilev (1921), (the latter shot by the Bolsheviks). He gave a general sketch of present day Russian literature, pointing out the predominance of poetry, not only in the numerical proportion of prose works to verse, but also in the poetical nature of most of the prose. He mentioned the principal schools of poetry: the older Symbolists (Blok and Bely), and the younger schools, the more classical school of Petrograd (Gumilev, Akhmatova) and the more advanced school of Moscow (Myakovsky, Esenin). He finally pointed out the possibility of a revival of prose in the work of young story-tellers.

To the discussion which followed, Professor R. Dyboski (of Cracow University) contributed some details on the fate of the Russian drama and theatre in recent years, out of his experience of Moscow theatres in 1915 and 1921. The flourishing state of Russian dramatic art before the revolution is well known, and the performances of Stanislavsky's Artistic Theatre are even now being ardently admired in Western capitals. It is less well known how in Russia itself, when the Soviet Government, ostensibly favouring the theatre, made efforts to degrade it into a mere vehicle of propaganda, a high standard of pure art was maintained on the Moscow stage through years of terror, ruin, and starvation. As an instance of this, Professor Dyboski singled out

a play by Yevreinov (a well-known writer on theatrical theory) which is called *The Most Important Thing* ("Samoye Glavnoye"). The play, produced in 1921, breathes a truly sublime idealism of belief in the noble social mission of the theatrical art as a perennial fountain of the happiness of illusion. Translated into Polish, the play is having a most successful run on the Warsaw and Cracow stages: it would well deserve being introduced to the English public as well.

On Tuesday, 6 March, Dr. Harold Williams gave a very thoughtful and suggestive address on "Russian Ideas and Russian Politics," showing the distinctive character which the former have given to the latter. He concluded as follows:—

"Formerly Russian ideas ran round the world and through the universe. They are now being concentrated through suffering and through the terrible experience of these last five years in Russia itself, in the great dispersion of Russians throughout Europe. Wherever Russians are, ideas are concentrating in a new form and with a new tendency. They are being concentrated on Russia herself as a definite object. Russia, for many Russians, was a place where they were born, the State that governed them, that held them down; but during the War the name Russia began to acquire a new meaning, and to strike deeper down into the emotions of Russians themselves. And as these years of suffering have gone by, with all the agonies, with the destruction of Russian society, with the terrible blasphemy and profanation of Russia, suddenly, for thousands and thousands of thinking Russians all the world over, now Russia itself has become an idea, the idea towards which all their thoughts are turned, and towards which their energies are working. And the fact that Russia itself has become the idea for Russians is the hope of Russia now."

Dr. Williams was followed by Mr. Charles R. Crane, one of America's foremost Russophiles, who has recently travelled through the Russian state from the Pacific to Europe. Mr. Crane gave a thoroughly thought out view of the present situation of the Russian people, avoiding all the conventional standards of judgment, and giving a lively picture of a state of things economic and psychological, which shows the complete bankruptcy of the Soviet attempt to impose an alien centralisation upon the mass of the people, whose passive resistance has made its success impossible.

57
SL

English

Vol. I. No. 3]

[MARCH 1923

Price Five Shillings net.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LIBRARY
**SLAVONIC
REVIEW**
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LIBRARY

A Survey of the Slavonic Peoples,
Their History, Economics, Philology and Literature

EDITORS
BERNARD PARES R. W. SETON-WATSON HAROLD WILLIAMS

CONTENTS

On Slavonic Reciprocity	- - - - -	PAUL NOVGORODTSEV
Klyuchevsky and Russian History	- - - - -	ALEXANDER KIESEWETTER
Slavistic Studies: an Addendum	- - - - -	VATROSLAV JAGIĆ
Early Russian Folk Epics	- - - - -	KATE BLAKEY
Transylvania (II.)	- - - - -	R. W. SETON-WATSON
The Early Diplomatic Relations of Great Britain and Serbia (III.)	- - - - -	MICHAEL GAVRILOVIĆ Minister of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes in London.
Bulgaria under Prince Alexander	- - - - -	LADY GROGAN
Labour Conditions in Modern Poland	- - - - -	J. H. PENSON
The Peasant in Polish Literature	- - - - -	THADDAEUS ZIELIŃSKI
The Peasants (II.)	- - - - -	From the Polish of W. S. REYMONT
At the Feast of the Gods: Dialogues on the Russian Revolution (III.)	- - - - -	SERGIUS BULGAKOV
Poems: An Episode from PUSHKIN'S FAIRY TALES (translated by OLIVER ELTON).	- - - - -	
Obituary. Chronicle. Economic Notes. Reviews. Bibliography (see over page).	- - - - -	

**PUBLISHED BY THE SCHOOL OF SLAVONIC STUDIES
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON, KING'S COLLEGE**

LIST OF CONTENTS (continued)

OBITUARY :—Josef Václav Myslbek (F. Chudoba); Alois Rašín (R. W. Seton-Watson); Antonín Kalina (R. W. Seton-Watson); the Bishop of Stara Zagora (Lady Grogan); Urban Jarník (O. Vočadlo); Ivan Tavčar (A. Železnikar).

CHRONICLE :—A. *Russia* : B. *Poland* : The Two Presidents—The Study of Polish in England. C. *Czechoslovakia*. D. *Russian Bolshevism and Islam* (by Sir Valentine Chirol).

ECONOMIC NOTES :—

Notes on Russian Industry. How to use Soviet Figures; (Agriculture and Export)—Poland : Area under Cultivation—Czechoslovakia : Growth of Population since 1910—Jugoslavia : Population, Area and Principal Towns—Bulgaria :—Export of Tobacco, Import of Copper Sulphate.

REVIEWS :—

Pessimism "in Excelsis" : *Europa-Rosja-Azja* (Europe, Russia, Asia). Prof. M. Zdziechowski (Roman Dyboski).

Kronprinz Rudolf : Politische Briefe an einen Freund. (R. W. Seton-Watson).

Magyariens Schuld Ungarns Sühne. Oskar Jászi : and other works (R. W. Seton-Watson).

La Jugoslavia. O. Randi (R. W. Seton-Watson).

Druga Vlada Miloša i Mihaila (The Second Reign of Princes Miloš and Michael). Slobodan Jovanović. (Michael Gavrilović).

Iz Srbije Kneza Miloša (From the Serbia of Prince Miloš). Tihomir Gjorgjević. M.G.

The Memoirs of Alexander Izvolsky. (Bernard Pares).

Forty Years of Diplomacy. Baron R. Rosen. (Baron A. Meyendorff).

Iranians and Greeks in South Russia. M. I. Rostovtsev. (Ellis H. Minns).

Südrussland im Altertum. Max Ebert. (E. H. M.).

Chetki. Belaya Staya. Anno Domini. Anna Akhmatova. (Prince D. S. Mirsky).

The Moscow Art Theatre Abroad. (H. T. Cheshire).

Otelo. Hamlet. Serbian translation by Svetislav Stefanović. (N. B. Jopson).

Vasilissa the Wise. A. V. Lunacharski.

Bezbozhnik. (The Atheist).

War and Peace. Leo Tolstoy. (Translated : Louise and Aylmer Maude).

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES :—Recent Bulgarian Publications. By L. C. Wharton.

NOTES ON OTHER SLAVONIC REVIEWS.

THE ANGLO-RUSSIAN SOCIETY.

UNIVERSITY NOTES :—Courses of Slavonic Study at the University of London, King's College : Conferences of University Teachers of Slavonic.

TRANSLITERATION AND ORTHOGRAPHY.

THE CONTRIBUTORS TO No. 3.—Biographical Notes.

MEMBERS AND CORRESPONDING MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL OF SLAVONIC STUDIES. (See pp. 3 and 4 of cover.)

THE SLAVONIC REVIEW will appear Thrice Yearly, in each Academic Term. Contributions (preferably in the language of the writer) must reach the Editors not later than 15 October, 15 January and 15 May respectively, or, if submitted in a language other than English, a fortnight earlier still.

All communications should be addressed—

THE EDITORS, SLAVONIC REVIEW, King's College, Strand, London, W.C.2.

Terms of Subscription :

5s. net per number (with postage 5s. 6d.). Annual Subscription, 15s. net, post free.

MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL OF SLAVONIC STUDIES.

- SIR PAUL VINOGRADOV, D.C.L., LL.D., F.B.A. (Fellow of the Russian Academy of Sciences; Corpus Professor in the University of Oxford; formerly Professor of the University of Moscow).
- J. F. BADDELEY: *The Russian Conquest of the Caucasus; Russia, Mongolia, China, etc.*
- HON. MAURICE BARING: *Mainsprings of Russia; Landmarks in Russian Literature, etc.*
- A. BRUCE BOSWELL (Professor of Russian in the University of Liverpool).
- J. B. BURY (Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge).
- FANNY S. COPELAND: translations from Ivo Vojnović, Tucić and other writers.
- J. D. DUFF (Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge). Translator of Aksakov; editor of *Russian Lyrics* and *Lermontov; The Novice*.
- SIR CHARLES ELIOT, K.C.M.G., C.B. *A Finnish Grammar*.
- SIR ARTHUR EVANS, D.Litt., F.R.S., P.S.A.
- NEVILL FORBES (Professor of Slavonic Languages in the University of Oxford).
- Dr. A. P. GOUDY (Reader in Russian in the University of Cambridge).
- STEPHEN GRAHAM: *Undiscovered Russia, etc.*; editor of Constable's Russian Library.
- S. N. HARPER (Professor of Russian in the University of Chicago).
- AYLMER MAUDE: *Life of Tolstoy*; translations from Tolstoy.
- JAMES MAVOR, Professor of Political Economy in the University of Toronto, author of *An Economic History of Russia*.
- Baron A. F. MEYENDORFF (Lecturer in Russian Laws and Institutions and in Russian Economics in the University of London; formerly Lecturer on the Russian Land Law in the University of Petrograd).
- Dr. WILLIAM MILLER: *The Balkans* (Story of the Nations); *The Ottoman Empire*; *The Latins in the Levant, etc.*
- Dr. ELLIS MINNS (Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge, Member of the Russian Archæological Society): *The Slavs* (Encyclopædia Britannica).
- ROSA NEWMARCH: *The Life and Letters of Chaykovsky; Poetry and Progress in Russia*.
- SIR BERNARD PARES (Professor of Russian in the University of London.)
- SIR E. DENISON ROSS (Director of the School of Oriental Studies, London.)
- R. W. SETON-WATSON (Professor of Central European History in the University of London).
- F. H. SKRINE: *The Expansion of Russia; The Heart of Asia* (in collaboration with Sir E. Denison Ross).
- A. H. E. TAYLOR: *The Future of the Southern Slavs*.
- H. W. V. TEMPERLEY (Reader in History in the University of Cambridge); *History of Serbia*.
- M. V. TROFIMOV (Professor of Russian Language and Literature in the Victoria University, Manchester).
- Miss L. F. WARING: *Serbia* (Home University Library).
- Dr. HAROLD WILLIAMS (Member of the Russian Geographical Society, Lecturer in the Ethnography of Russia in the University of London).
- Dr. C. HAGBERG WRIGHT (Librarian of the London Library).

CONTENTS OF No. 1.

The Position of the Slavs in the New Europe	-	THOMAS G. MASARYK, President of the Czechoslovak Republic
Russia	- - - - -	PETER STRUVE
A Survey of Slavistic Studies	- - - - -	VATROSLAV JAGIĆ
The Objectives of Russian Study in Britain	-	BERNARD PARES
The Composition of the Earlier Russian Chronicles	-	NEVILL FORBES
The Early Diplomatic Relations of Great Britain and Serbia (I.)	- - - - -	MICHAEL GAVRILOVIĆ, Minister of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes in London
The Russian Radicals of the Sixties	- - - - -	H. T. CHESHIRE
Percy's "Reliques," Sir Walter Scott's "Min- strelsy," and the Roumanian Ballads	- - - - -	MARCU BEZA
The Russian Co-operative Movement	- - - - -	A. V. BAYKALOV
Land Reform in Czechoslovakia	- - - - -	JOSEPH MACEK
The Agrarian Problem in Hungary	- - - - -	ARNOLD DÁNIEL
At the Feast of the Gods: Dialogues on the Russian Revolution (I.)	- - - - -	SERGIUS BULGAKOV
The Dying Republic. Act I.	- - - - -	from the Serbo-Croat of COUNT IVO VOJNOVIĆ
Poems	- - - - -	from the Russian of A. A. FET
Obituary. Chronicle. Notes. Reviews. Bibliography.		

CONTENTS OF No. 2.

Poland	- - - - -	CONSTANTINE SKIRMUNT, Polish Minister in London
Political and Economic Progress in Poland	-	STANISLAS KUTRZEBA
Slavonic Studies in France	- - - - -	LOUIS EISENMANN
Transylvania (I.)	- - - - -	R. W. SETON-WATSON
Literary Memorials of the Czech Reformation	-	ARNE NOVAK
The Early Diplomatic Relations of Great Britain and Serbia (II.)	- - - - -	MICHAEL GAVRILOVIĆ, Minister of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes in London
Some Thoughts on the Style of Dostoyevsky	-	EUGENE LYATSKY
Leoš Janáček and Moravian Music Drama	-	ROSA NEWMARCH
The Months before the Russian Revolution	-	BASIL SHULGIN
At the Feast of the Gods: Dialogues on the Russian Revolution (II.)	- - - - -	SERGIUS BULGAKOV
The Trade Balance of Russia	- - - - -	MARGARET S. MILLER
Difficulties of the Exchange in Czechoslovakia	-	JOSEF DRACHOVSKÝ
The Peasants (I.)	- - - - -	From the Polish of W. S. REYMONT
Poems: Gadfly and Ant: Two Dogs (from the Russian of KRYLOV)		
An Exile's Hymn at Sunset on the Sea (from the Polish of SLOWACKI)		
The Death of Ivo (a Croat Ballad)		
Obituary. Chronicle. Notes. Reviews. Bibliography.		

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 123929751